FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-144
Friday
28 July 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-144 *28 July 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Peace Committee's Bogdanov Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jul]* 1
Gerasimov on Gorbachev's Tactical Weapons Offer *[London TV]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Shevardnadze on Bloch Affair, Cambodia Talks *[AFP]* 4
Gerasimov Gives Foreign Ministry Press Briefing 4
Comments on B-2 Bomber, Bloch *[PRAVDA 28 Jul]* 4
Names Stockholm Talks Participants *[TASS]* 4
Kuznetsov Views Emigration Data, Visa Problems *[PRAVDA 28 Jul]* 4
Envoy Discusses Implementation of Vienna Accords *[TASS]* 5
Gorbachev Greets European Peace Campaigners *[PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 5
Kornilov Assesses East-West Military Contacts *[TASS]* 5
UNESCO Chief Interviewed on Aid to USSR *[MOSCOW NEWS No 30]* 6
Comments on Soviet Participation *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jul]* 7

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Reverts to 'Notorious' Reagan Defense Policy *[Bogachev on TASS]* 8
Results of Bush Visit to Hungary, Poland Assessed *[MOSCOW NEWS No 30]* 8
Norfolk Welcomes USSR Navy Visitors *[PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 9

China

Further Reports on Visit of PRC's Tian Jiyun 9
Tour of Leningrad Detailed *[PRAVDA 25 Jul]* 9
Briefing on Reforms in Ukraine *[PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 10
Delegation Leaves Moscow 27 Jul *[TASS]* 10
Results of USSR-PRC Economic Cooperation Session *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]* 10
CPC's Jiang Cited on Reforms, Party Building *[PRAVDA 25 Jul]* 11
Agreement Reached To Open Sino-Soviet Railway *[TASS]* 11
NOVOYE VREMYA Cited on Recent Beijing Incidents *[Moscow International]* 12

Northeast Asia

Further Reportage on Visit by MPR's Batmonh 12
Holds Talks With Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]* 12
Tours 'Ramenskiy' Combine *[PRAVDA 28 Jul]* 13
Assesses Bilateral Relations *[TASS]* 14
Departs Moscow 28 Jul *[TASS]* 14

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Cambodian Peace *[PRAVDA 28 Jul]* 14
Preliminary Cambodian Peace Talks Held in Paris *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jul]* 16
Cambodia's Declaration of Neutrality Reported *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jul]* 16
Neutrality Decision 'Historic' *[Tsvetov in PRAVDA 25 Jul]* 17
Philippine President Favors Expanding Relations *[Moscow International]* 17
SRV Delegation Makes Stopover in Moscow *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]* 17

Near East & South Asia

Arab Leaders Briefed on Arms Deal With Iran *[Kuwait AL-QABAS 26 Jul]* 18
Ryzhkov Meets With Iranian Minister Nabavi *[PRAVDA 28 Jul]* 19
Najibullah Sees Soviet POW-Release Delegation *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jul]* 19
POW Release Group Finds 'Breakthrough' in Kabul *[PRAVDA 23 Jul]* 20
Afghan Spokesman on U.S. Supplies to Rebels *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Jul]* 20
USSR-Kuwaiti Cultural Agreement Signed *[Kuwait KUNA]* 21
Kuwaiti Military Delegation Ends 1-Week Visit *[Kuwait KUNA]* 21
Pakistan To Equip F-16 With 'Nuclear Weapons' *[PRAVDA 24 Jul]* 21

Sub-Saharan Africa

CPSU Delegation Arrives in Brazzaville *[TASS]* 21
CPSU Greets Frelimo Congress in Mozambique *[TASS]* 21
Reflections on 6 Sep South African Elections *[Valentinov on Moscow International]* 22
Lithuania's Baltrunas Heads Delegation to Congo *[PRAVDA 25 Jul]* 22
Ambassador to Togo Appointed *[PRAVDA 23 Jul]* 23

East Europe

Jaruzelski-Walesa Discussion Reported *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]* 23
Yazov's Anniversary Message to Poland's Siwicki *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Jul]* 23
Yakovlev's Meeting With MSZMP's Ivanyi Noted *[PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 23
Hungarian-Soviet Talks 'Important Milestone' *[Moscow International]* 23
Outcome of Hungarian By-Elections Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jul]* 24
SFRY Presidency Composition Now Complete *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jul]* 24
CPCZ Secretariat Discusses Political Training *[PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 25
CPCZ Claim of Western 'Subversion' Cited *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Jul]* 26
Czechoslovak Leaders Vacationing in USSR *[PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 26

West Europe

Further Reportage on Yazov, Biryukova UK Visit 26
Yazov-Younger News Conference *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jul]* 26
Yazov Meets Foreign Secretary Mayor *[TASS]* 27
Yazov Visits Military Centers *[TASS]* 27
Biryukova Tours Enterprises *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]* 27
Adamishin, UK Official Discuss African Conflicts *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jul]* 28
Soviet Envoy To Mediate on Bulgaria-Turkey Issue *[Ankara ANATOLIA]* 28
Allegations on Turkish Weapon Supplies Refuted *[Ankara ANATOLIA]* 28
Turkish Coverage of Nagorno-Karabakh Criticized *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 8 Jul]* 28
Reportage on French Senate Delegation's Visit 29
Dobrynin Receives Delegation *[TASS]* 29
Soviet of Union Chairman Meets Group *[TASS]* 29
Delegation Departs Moscow *[TASS]* 30
Cypriots Mark 1974 Coup, Invasion Anniversary *[PRAVDA 22 Jul]* 30
Karpov Receives Italian, Egyptian Envoys *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jul]* 30
Kovalev Receives Italian Ambassador 13 Jul *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jul]* 30
Petrovskiy Receives Greek Ambassador 19 Jul *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jul]* 30
Gorbachev Sends Greetings to Luxembourg Ruler *[TASS]* 30

Latin America & Caribbean

Moscow Meeting Marks Cuban Anniversary *[PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 31
Yazov Greets Raul Castro on Cuban Jubilee *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jul]* 31
Cuban Charge Speaks on 'National Uprising Day' *[Moscow TV]* 31

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Supreme Soviet Discusses Baltic Issues 27 Jul
Lukyanov on Financial Autonomy *[Moscow TV]*
Brazauskas Statement on Baltics Bill 26 Jul
Abalkin Addresses Supreme Soviet Session *[Moscow Radio]*
Economic Autonomy Discussed *[Moscow Radio]*
Deputies View Economic Autonomy *[Moscow Radio]*
Lithuanian Deputy Queried on Financial Autonomy *[Moscow TV]*
Maslyukov on Baltic Autonomy *[Moscow Radio]*
Baltic Autonomy Issues Debated *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Jul]*
Supreme Soviet Adopts Decisions *[Moscow Radio]*
Ryzhkov Addresses Supreme Soviet *[Moscow Radio]*
Supreme Soviet Discusses Nikitin Candidacy *[Moscow Radio]*
Prices Nominee Address Supreme Soviet *[Moscow Radio]*
Supreme Soviet Debates Decrees, Endorses Nine *[TASS]*
Estonia's Kogan on 'Political' Strikes *[Moscow TV]*
Legal Committee Chairman Discusses Labor Disputes *[Moscow Radio]*
26 Jul Supreme Soviet Session Proceedings
Economic Reform Viewed *[Moscow Radio]*
Financial Autonomy Considered *[Moscow Radio]*
Baltic 'Prepared' for Financial Autonomy *[Moscow Radio]*
Deputies on Economic Autonomy *[Moscow Radio]*
Further on Baltic Debate *[Moscow Radio]*
Resolution on Supreme Soviet Bodies' Tasks *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]*
Correction to Confirmation of Armed Forces Cuts
Mine Strikes Situation, Negotiations Updated
Vorkuta Miners 'Suspend' Strike *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jul]*
Vorkuta Miners Increase Production *[TASS]*
Donetsk Strike Committee Members Cited *[Moscow TV]*
Voronin Holds Talks With Miners *[TASS]*
Further on Ryzhkov Meeting With Miners *[PRAVDA 25 Jul]*
Coal Miner Union Leader Interviewed *[Hamburg STERN 27 Jul]*
Strikes Due to 'Half-Hearted' Reforms *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]*
Further Reportage on Abkhaziya Situation
Patrol Kills Sniper in Sukhumi *[Moscow Radio]*
Sniping at Gulripsha Traffic Control Post *[Moscow TV]*
Weapons, Explosives Confiscated *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]*
Sukhumi Official Cited *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jul]*
RSFSR Supreme Soviet 28 Jul Session Reported *[TASS]*
RSFSR Supreme Soviet 27 Jul Session Reported
Vlasov Delivers Report *[Moscow Radio]*
Consumer Goods Production Criticized *[Moscow Radio]*
RSFSR Supreme Soviet 26 Jul Session Reported
Session Summarized *[TASS]*
Government Changes Announced *[TASS]*
Latvian Supreme Soviet 27 Jul Session Reported
Political, Social Issues Discussed *[TASS]*
Report on Latvian Constitution Given *[Riga Radio]*
Voting Held for Economic Autonomy *[Moscow Radio]*
Official Cited on Financial Autonomy *[Moscow Radio]*
Law on Economic Sovereignty Discussed *[Moscow TV]*
Supreme Soviet Group Goes to Nagorno-Karabakh
Commission Arrives in Stepanakert 20 Jul *[Yerevan ARMENPRES]*
Activities on 21, 22 Jul Highlighted *[ARMENPRES]*
Karabakh 'Problem' Viewed *[Yerevan International]*
Activities on 24, 25 Jul Outlined *[ARMENPRES]*
'Calm' Over Nagorno-Karabakh Urged *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 16 Jul]*
Update on Situation in Uzbek's Fergana *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]*

Sociologist View Reasons for Uzbek Strife *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 70
Zaykov Addresses Moscow Party Meeting *[TASS]]* 71
Zaykov Meeting With Moscow Journalists Lauded *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 71
Yakovlev Addresses Conference on Foreign Activity *[TASS]* 72
Further on Kazakhstan Personnel Changes *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 72
Local Officials Change Jobs *[KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Jul]* 73
Lithuanians Appeal Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact *[Vilnius International]* 73
Assessment of Agreement Urged *[Moscow International]* 73
Vilnius Rally Marks 1920 USSR Peace Treaty *[Vilnius International]* 74
Supreme Soviet Attitudes to Lithuania Assessed *[Vilnius International]* 74
Possible Estonia-Sweden Trade Ties Viewed *[Stockholm Radio]* 75
Former CPSU Members in Armenia Rehabilitated *[Yerevam Radio]* 75
Kashlev Says Democratization 'Irreversible' *[Vienna DER STANDARD 7 Jul]* 75
Popular Front's Savisaar Receives Estonian Posts *[Stockholm Radio]* 76
'Socioeconomic Sovereignty' of Republics Urged *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 77
Yeltsin on Western View of Soviet 'Crisis' *[Moscow International]* 77
Murashev Discusses Relationship With Gorbachev *[Vienna PROFIL 17 Jul]* 77
Public Reaction to Congress Relays Outlined *[IZVESTIYA 24 Jun]* 79
Gdlyan Repeats 'Kremlin Scandal' Charge *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 22 Jul]* 80
Andreyva Article Attacking Perestroyka Cited *[AFP]* 85
Sychev Interviewed on Improving Output Quality *[TASS]* 86
V. Petrovskiy Speaks on New Political Thinking *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jul]* 86
Biryukova Ends Visit to Penza Region, Comments *[TASS]* 87
Biryukova Interviewed on Visit *[Moscow TV]* 87
CPSU's Grachev Discusses Pan-European Process *[Milan L'UNITA 5 Jul]* 88
Economic Expert on EC-CEMA Relations *[Vienna DER STANDARD 6 Jul]* 89
Medvedev Meets With Estonian Workers, Journalists *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 7 Jul]* 90
Further on Secretary Medvedev in Estonia *[IZVESTIYA 7 Jul]* 91
Ideology Deputy Shares Views on Glasnost *[Paris LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS 4 Jul]* 92
Chebrikov Attends Prosecutor's Office Collegium *[TASS]* 94
Silayev Remarks on Managerial Training *[Moscow Radio]* 94
Maslyukov Addresses Council of Ministers Academy *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 94
Zaykov Meets Bio-Organic Institute Scientists *[Moscow TV]* 95
Gromyko Accorded Traditional Burial Honors *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 27]* 95
Il-62 Lands Safely Without Nose Cone in Moscow *[TASS]* 95
Medical Official Gives AIDS Statistics *[TASS]* 95
Development of Cooperative Sector Viewed *[TASS]* 96
Dual-Use Chemical Export Controls Enacted *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 18 Jul]* 96
Export Controls Placed on Household Items *[Moscow Radio]* 96
'Solemn Meeting' Marks Metallurgists' Day *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 16 Jul]* 97
Journal Sets Up Council on Interethnic Relations *[TASS]* 97
Censorship of Space Encyclopedia Discussed *[Moscow TV]* 97
Publication of Solzhenitsyn Works Planned *[MOSCOW NEWS No 29]* 98
Paper To Carry Biographies of New Ministers *[Moscow International]* 99
New Church To Be Constructed in Lithuania *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 100
Collectivization in Lithuania Reproached *[TIESA 7 Apr]* 100
Kazakh Private Detective Agency Formed *[TASS]* 102
First Tatar-Language Supplement Published *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jul]* 102
Ecology Publication Appears in Kostroma *[Moscow Radio]* 102

Economic

1989 Midyear Economic Results Released *[Moscow TV]* 102
Aganbegyan To Head Soviet-Swiss Joint Venture *[MOSCOW NEWS No 30]* 103

Agricultural

Problems in Grain Transport Reported *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jul]* 104
Rainfall Causes Flooding in Maritime Kray *[Moscow Radio]* 105

Military

'Vremya' Newscast Reports on Tank Conversion *[Moscow TV]* 106
Yazov, Lizichev Discuss Gorbachev Report *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Jul]* 106
Adm Makarov Says USSR Needs Strong Navy *[TASS]* 107
Military Freight Train Blast Kills Two *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Jul]* 107

Peace Committee's Bogdanov Interviewed
PM2807092589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
27 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Prof R.G. Bogdanov, first deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, by G. Charodeyev: "Breaking Out of the Closed Circle Is What the 'People's Diplomacy' Proposes"; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The public commission for questions of international security and disarmament has existed for many years under the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace. Everything has happened in its work. Its very title has sometimes appeared in newspapers and journals and sometimes disappeared. The commission has begun to work in earnest only in recent years. Its ranks have been joined by respectable scientists and experts and distinguished journalists—in their overwhelming majority active and creative people. For a year now the commission has been headed by Prof R.G. Bogdanov, first deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace and department chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Moscow State Institute of International Relations.

"It is no secret," he said in a talk with an IZVESTIYA correspondent, "that our work has come down, as they say in the army, to TTP: talking, talking, and parting. There was no real return. But we have rid ourselves of unnecessary ballast and of people who saw their work in the commission only as traveling abroad and describing the Soviet Union's latest peace actions there. We are not a lecture group but an organization in which social thought is accumulated and ideas and methods of implementing them are accumulated.

In the commission's new composition work began with public hearings being held before the USSR Supreme Soviet's discussion of the question of the ratification of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. At the time this was ab absolutely unique act. The commission heard several dozen Soviet citizens representing the most diverse strata of our society and examined 10-15 different viewpoints. Then the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace instructed us to generalize opinions and to represent the viewpoint of the Soviet public in the Supreme Soviet. This was also a first and attested to the fact that Soviet public opinion is becoming a permanent factor of the policy of disarmament."

[Charodeyev] Where do you see the essence of the disarmament problem today?

[Bogdanov] All those who have been studying this question for many years and particularly recently feel ambivalent. On the one hand the situation which has taken shape is such that disarmament has been assigned to some independent field of knowledge. Some people are even inclined to say that it has become an independent branch of science.

Another viewpoint: Disarmament has become a purely technocratic problem where decisions are possible with the aid of computers, formulas, and very complex mathematical calculations and balances.

Disarmament problems have indeed acquired independent importance and become an exceptionally complex field of human activity. Probably all those elements which I have enumerated are indeed present in the disarmament problem. For all that I think there is a main question: Disarmament is politics. Or more precisely I would say that it is not disarmament but the policy of disarmament which is the quickest way to security.

If you agree that disarmament is politics, and politics based on the principles of the new thinking, then this gives grounds for very serious thought and conclusions. And we can now speak of three principles in approaches toward the policy of disarmament.

I would define the first principle as the desire to understand the opposite side's position. The second as a critical attitude toward one's own position. And the third as the search for a balance of interests in the policy of disarmament. In addition to everything else it is essential to replace confrontationist disarmament approaches, the principle of dividing things into "what's mine and what belongs to others," the principle of the balance of forces, with the principle of the balance of interests and disarmament.

[Charodeyev] Radomir Georgiyevich, how do you assess the progress achieved in the 3 ½ years since the Soviet Union put forward the program for creating a nuclear-free nonviolent world? In your view, is it realistic to implement the 15 January 1986 program within the temporal framework which it stipulates—before 2000?

[Bogdanov] This is a complex question and perturbs very many people. There is a quite clear division into two camps. The supporters of one camp believe that it is quite possible for us to implement before the year 2000 the "Gorbachev plan" in accordance with which nuclear weapons will be eliminated in the course of 15 years. The supporters of the second camp are inclined to consider this plan to be utopian, illusory, or simply propagandist. It must be admitted that the two camps exist not only abroad but also in our country.

I have been engaged in nuclear problems for over 10 years. I believe that a nuclear-free world is entirely feasible. It is only that my practical approach is absolutely different and untraditional and goes beyond the framework of what is accepted in our official policy.

But let's look into the matter: What does the traditional path mean in disarmament? Talks on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons are under way in Geneva. I personally have fears that, as has happened before, while talks are under way and while this treaty is being signed and then ratified it will have already become obsolete and the ceilings and parameters agreed in it will not accord with the interests of the sides' security.

I am becoming increasingly convinced that it is essential to proceed along the path of a breakthrough of if you like of unilateral actions which, of course, should in no event jeopardize the USSR's security but which are of enormous practical importance. I recall the absolutely splendid metaphor of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary about the "collection of mothballs" which filled the paths toward the solution of many disarmament problems. It sounded like a revelation in Reykjavik. So I assert that all the disarmament talks are continuing to flounder in mothballs. We ourselves are driving them into an impasse. Is it not immoral to accumulate thousands of strategic warheads? Is it not immoral to acquire opportunities to wage any kind of nuclear war from a "limited" one to a large strategic one? How could we grow accustomed to this? But I want to recall that all this was imposed on us by the Americans. It is their line and it was they who dragged us into such dangerous games.

It seems to me that the following nontraditional approach will at least help us rid ourselves of the "collection of mothballs." Why can we not say that we are stopping the old games? You can produce 200,000 nuclear charges. That's your business. But we will target approximately 16 key cities in the United States. Far fewer nuclear munitions will be needed to strike them if a nuclear conflict is provoked. This "retargeting" is no more immoral than the constant nuclear race. We can expect a very interesting reaction from the U.S. Congress. I do not know how the United States will extract the money for nuclear weapons in that event. Perhaps that would be the breakthrough everyone is seeking.

A great time of creative fantasy has now come. Breaking out of the closed circle of stereotypes—that is the paramount task. To this day we are captive to conservative thinking, but movements, a spurt of activity, are needed. It was this that M.S. Gorbachev talked out in January in his speech from the UN General Assembly rostrum.

I do not think our ideas will be approved by all professionals, politicians and military men. But let's discuss them. Perhaps we will find an absolutely new decision and new parameters for settling our strategic relations.

I am now engaged in a detailed elaboration of this problem and in the very near future I intend to publish a large scientific article on this topical. I have also voiced my ideas publicly at a scientific and practical conference in the Foreign Ministry....

[Charodeyev] As is well known, at its 40th jubilee session in Brussels the NATO council adopted a declaration containing an account of NATO's policy, of which President G. Bush's proposals for reducing armaments and armed forces in Europe have become a component part. Professionals assess them as a "serious and constructive response" to the Warsaw Pact countries' initiatives.

[Bogdanov] It was with great interest that I familiarized myself with the proposals formulated by President Bush. This is perhaps the first time the Western side has made specific proposals with a very solid positive charge. The U.S. initiatives go halfway to meet what the Soviet side and the Warsaw Pact countries proposed before. The President believes that the entire disarmament process must be completed in 6-12 months. The Americans' "impatience" is understandable and it gives us very great hope in terms of future talks.

[Charodeyev] How do you intend to embody your theoretical ideas in the work of the Commission on Questions of International Security and Disarmament and in the work of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace in general?

[Bogdanov] Today an absolutely new and favorable situation arises for all those who are engaged in problems of disarmament—especially the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace. The point is that the Congress of People's Deputies and then the USSR Supreme Soviet formulated very precisely our state's position in the defense field. As a result, perhaps for the first time in many years these problems have indeed been raised to a statewide, nationwide level. And our position is very precise—we are in need of reliable defense. Defense, the deputies said at the Congress, remains for us a question of vital importance in implementing the principle of reasonable sufficiency. What opportunities does this formulation create for us? Great scope is opened up for the renewal of active, creative discussion. After all, even now the problem of reasonable sufficiency from the viewpoint of its fundamental interpretation is still far from perfect. And later, in the supreme organ of state power, commissions and committees appeared which will engage directly in problems of security and disarmament.

I see our commission as one of the very important organs of the Soviet peace movement. It can integrate the Soviet public's different views of the problem of international security. For many decades this was forbidden fruit. It was the monopoly of professionals and military men and civilians were not allowed in. Now disarmament is an open field where everyone can voice his viewpoint. So we want to regularly submit these thoughts and ideas to the Soviet Government and USSR Supreme Soviet. We are counting on presenting the viewpoint of the Soviet public in the form of generalized documents, reports, and proposals. I am even prepared to begin the enterprising elaboration of standing proposals.

Unfortunately, apart from the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, we so far have no other such public organization. Yes, there are highly professional forums where people communicate and speak in a professional language which you and I would not understand if we were there. Yet it is precisely ordinary, rank and file people who should have priority in expressing their view over all the others because they are the main target of the pernicious plans to use nuclear or any other lethal weapon. Only by joint efforts will we be able to rid ourselves forever of the "collection of mothballs." Otherwise we shall not achieve a nuclear-free world.

Gerasimov on Gorbachev's Tactical Weapons Offer
PM0707134089 London ITV Television Network in English 1800 GMT 6 Jul 89

[Interview with Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov by Nicholas Owen as part of the Channel 4 News program—recorded, monitored in progress]

[Excerpt] [Owen] I spoke to Gennadiy Gerasimov, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, who's in Strasbourg with Mr Gorbachev, and I asked him how significant was the Soviet leader's latest arms proposal.

[Gerasimov] It is not another offer. It's his idea—I should say it's his pet idea—to get the world free from nuclear arms by the year 2000, so he tries to find additional suggestions how to do it. And this time he said that we are ready to start cutting on our tactical nuclear forces, if the West agrees to begin negotiations on the subject.

[Owen] It's sometimes said in the West that Mr Gorbachev is really on a charm offensive. Do you not agree that what he's had to say today is really more of that and that there's not much real substance in it?

[Gerasimov] Well, I think that when he proposes negotiations on a very serious question, it's not, it's not...[Gerasimov changes thought] It's something very substantial. If you reject it, there is no substance; but if we agree, there is lots of substance—and in this speech there is a lot of concrete proposals. For instance, he said that why not have a working group on conversion—how to move from military industry to civilian industry—because if we want to cut arms we don't need that many military plants and factories.

[Owen] But don't the fundamental differences between the two blocs mean the continuation of the Berlin Wall; the Warsaw Pact versus NATO?

[Gerasimov] No, I don't like—we don't like—this military confrontation. We suggested actually long ago—and we repeat this suggestion—that you must disband NATO and Warsaw Pact simultaneously. The West is not ready yet. You still see the image of the enemy on the other side of our continent.

[Owen] The Soviet spokesman, Gennadiy Gerasimov.

Shevardnadze on Bloch Affair, Cambodia Talks

AU2807151189 Paris AFP in English 1458 GMT 28 Jul 89

[Text] Paris, July 28 (AFP)—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze arrived here Friday ahead of the international peace conference on Cambodia which opens in Paris on Sunday [30 July], officials said. On his arrival at Orly airport near Paris, Mr. Shevardnadze said of the conference: "If there was no hope of peace, I would not be here. There is a way to find a peaceful solution."

In other remarks, Mr. Shevardnadze played down the reports surrounding Felix Bloch, a senior U.S. State Department official suspected of spying for the Soviet Union. "I have been told he was a good diplomat. He had no contact with us, nothing that can arouse the least suspicion," Mr. Shevardnadze said, adding: "I am amazed at all the fuss it has created—it is not serious."

Mr. Shevardnadze said the situation in Lebanon had deteriorated, but he did not rule out the possibility of holding an international peace conference for the country. "We have got to give it a lot of thought because it is a difficult question," he said.

Mr. Shevardnadze, along with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and the foreign ministers of the other three permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, will attend the Cambodia conference.

Earlier Thursday, Hanoi announced that all Vietnamese troops would be pulled out of Cambodia by September 27, three days ahead of schedule.

Gerasimov Gives Foreign Ministry Press Briefing

Comments on B-2 Bomber, Bloch

PM2807114989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jul 89 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report under general heading "In the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] At a briefing held in Moscow 27 July G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, commented specifically on the U.S. Senate's discussion of appropriations for the production of 132 B-2 bombers. He emphasized in this context that the Soviet Union adheres to the strategy of defense sufficiency where there is no room for a first strike.

Unfortunately, he remarked, people in the United States are turning back to thinking the unthinkable and pondering how to wage a nuclear war. In the present state of Soviet-U.S. relations, the Foreign Ministry spokesman pointed out, changes in U.S. strategic concepts could provide a material base for strategic instability. Deliberations on how better to wage nuclear war, backed by corresponding developments [razrabotka] of new systems, are suicidal. They run contrary to the spirit of all present Soviet-U.S.accords, it was emphasized at the briefing.

Speaking of the spy-mania campaign launched in the United States in association with the disappearance of U.S. diplomat Felix Bloch, G.I. Gerasimov noted that until the last few days his name meant nothing to anyone in the Soviet Union and we have absolutely nothing to do with him.

Names Stockholm Talks Participants

LD2707162189 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Excerpt] Moscow July 27 TASS—Soviet-American consultations on Afghanistan are due in Stockholm from July 31 to August 1, Soviet Foreign Ministry chief spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today. The consultations will be confined to Afghanistan alone. They aim at a joint search for sensible political ways to de-block the situation around that country.

Gerasimov said that Soviet-American consultations had begun today with visiting U.S. assistant secretary of state, Bureau for International Organization Affairs, John Bolton. The Soviet side is headed by Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovsky. [passage omitted]

Kuznetsov Views Emigration Data, Visa Problems

PM2807132589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jul 89 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report under general headline "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] The Soviet Union attaches major importance to the implementation of all accords, without any exception, reached by the 35 countries at the Vienna meeting. The pan-European process has been developing constructively and dynamically in the 6 months since the meeting. This opinion was expressed at a news conference in Moscow 27 July by Special Envoy Yu.V. Kashlev, who headed the Soviet delegation to several CSCE forums in the last few years.

R.A. Kuznetsov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] Visas and Registration Administration [upravleniye], described the state of affairs in the sphere of emigration from the Soviet Union. He announced that last year 108,000 persons left our country to assume permanent residence abroad, with a further 91,000 in the first 6 months of this year.

As of 19 January 1989, the speaker went on, 1,855 applications for exit visas remained outstanding. There were 1,450 applications for short-term visits and 405 for permanent residence. Following an analysis of the material, 84 percent of the applications were granted: 1,325 for short-term travel and 231 for permanent residence. At the same time, in conformity with international

documents including the Vienna document and according to Soviet legislation provisions, applications by 299 persons cannot be granted for the time being due to specific circumstances.

Major complications have developed as regards the receipt of entry visas, the chief of the MVD Visas and Registration Administration said. Special problems have developed as regards receipt of entry visas for the United States, and there are 28,000 persons waiting for visas at present. In this context he called on all Soviet citizens who have been issued foreign travel passports not to resign from their jobs, not to sell off their property, and not assign or sell their housing area until such time as they have received the relevant entry visas.

Envoy Discusses Implementation of Vienna Accords
LD2707152189 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 27 TASS—The Soviet Union is implementing all the accords, without exception, agreed by 35 states at the Vienna meeting, Yuriy Kashlev, head of the Soviet delegation to Vienna, told a briefing at the Foreign Ministry press center today. He stressed that the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's recent visits to Great Britain, West Germany and France, and his speech in Strasbourg have imparted the idea of a common European house into a practical plane.

In the Soviet Union, the Soviet diplomat noted further, dozens of ministries, departments and organizations are involved in the work to implement the Vienna Accords. Provision of the Vienna document have found reflection in the draft laws on public associations and organizations, freedom of conscience, and on leaving and entering the country which are prepared to be submitted for consideration by the USSR Supreme Soviet. The complete text of the Vienna final document has been published in the Soviet Union in a mass edition. New rules have been adopted to regulate professional activity of foreign correspondents in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has joined the Vienna convention on consular relations and has recognised as binding the jurisdiction of the U.N. International Court of Justice relating to a number of important conventions dealing with human rights. The Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union has adopted a special resolution on the order of implementation of the Vienna agreements on trade, economic, scientific and technical matters and environmental protection. Practical implementation has begun of the provision for opening, on a bilateral basis, of centers of culture and information in the Soviet Union and some other countries. Many agreements on cultural exchanges and youth contacts have been concluded.

"The Soviet Union expects its partners in the European process to respond in kind and implement the Vienna accords with full responsibility," Yuriy Kashlev said in conclusion. "As this would conform to the aim, reiterated in Vienna, of creating a Europe of security, cooperation and trust."

Gorbachev Greets European Peace Campaigners
PM2707135389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 89 Second Edition p1

[Undated M. Gorbachev message to Murmansk Peace Festival]

[Text] To the participants in the Murmansk Peace Festival:

I send cordial greetings to you, champions of peace and good-neighborliness. Your meeting, which culminated in a North European peace march, is further convincing evidence of people's desire in various countries to make Europe into a common home that is safe and comfortable for all, where everyone can live in his own way and enjoy a good relationship with others.

In building a peaceful Europe, first of all we have to make the final break with the policy of force and "nuclear deterrence," that legacy of the cold war. A truly peaceful order on the continent is incompatible with nuclear weapons. It also presupposes a reduction in all types of arms and armed forces, which will rule out the very possibility of a war being unleashed.

The Soviet Union supports the proposal to turn Northern Europe into a nuclear-free zone and is in favor of jointly developing its natural resources and establishing a unified system to monitor the state of the environment. The Congress of USSR People's Deputies gave the force of law to our foreign policy course, which is based on new thinking.

In order to move together toward civilized relations worthy of the 21st century, efforts are needed from statesmen. But no less important now are broad dialogue among ordinary citizens and their active participation in all areas: disarmament, ecology, culture, and the humanitarian and legal spheres.
We wish you and your remarkable meeting success!
M. Gorbachev

Kornilov Assesses East-West Military Contacts
LD2707170589 Moscow TASS in English 1639 GMT 27 Jul 89

[By TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov]

[Text] Moscow July 27 TASS—The Soviet defence minister's first visit to Britain is an illustration of the two countries desire to establish trust and mutual understanding, said British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher when receiving General of the Army Dmitriy Yazov.

This visit has undoubtedly become a very important and highly positive event in the development of Anglo-Soviet relations. The DAILY TELEGRAPH points out that the visit will promote a better understanding of each other. Another British newspaper, THE TIMES, expresses hope that the visit will make it possible to put contacts between the servicemen of the two countries on a regular basis.

Many analysts, commenting on Yazov's visit, note that representatives of military circles, along with politicians, parliamentarians and scientists, are now playing an increasingly active role in the current constructive political dialogue between the countries of the East and West.

This is really so. Let us, for example, look through the record of Soviet-American contacts. Only 18 months ago a visit to the United States by the chief of the general staff of the USSR Armed Forces or a visit to Moscow by the U.S. secretary of defence were regarded by some people as sensational.

Such visits have now become commonplace. This June, Admiral William Crowe, chairman of the U.S. joint chiefs of staff, visited Moscow. Hardly anyone several years ago could imagine a Soviet military leader visiting Capitol Hill or Soviet Navymen appearing on American soil.

U.S. congressmen now applaude Soviet Marshall Sergey Akhromeyev who addresses congress while residents of Norfolk, Virginia, where a large U.S. naval base is located, warmly welcome the crew of the Soviet missile cruiser Marshal Ustinov and other Soviet Navy ships that arrived at American shores for an official visit.

What is the purpose and use of such contacts? First of all, it seems, in directly comparing various concepts and positions in an open and frank dialogue on pivotal problems of our times connected with disarmament and security.

Our country and representatives of the Soviet Armed Forces have something to say on this. We are convinced—and this was again recently confirmed by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies—that the security of all countries should be ensured first of all by political means. Hence the basic principles of Soviet military doctrine which is of purely defensive orientation.

The Soviet Union, Yazov told a news conference in London, strives for a nuclear-free future and, should confrontation remain, it must be at the lowest possible level.

Of course, the positions of the Soviet Union and NATO countries over a number of issues diverge, and substantially, too, and it would be wrong to pass over in silence these 'sharp angles'.

But something else is important: as is illustrated by Yazov's visit to Britain, the East-West dialogue involving military leaders becomes increasngly substantive, and there can be no doubt that this makes it possible to broaden the area of mutual understanding step by step and to build up the potential of trust.

UNESCO Chief Interviewed on Aid to USSR

PM2707160289 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 30, 23 Jul 89 p 4

[Interview with UNESCO Director General Federico Mayor by Vitaliy Tretyakov and Vitaliy Bangertskiy: "From the Culture of War to the Culture of Peace"—date and place not given]

[Excerpts] Shortly before his visit to Moscow, Federico Mayor, Director General of UNESCO, kindly granted an interview to "MN" [MOSCOW NEWS] special correspondents Vitaliy Tretyakov and Aleksandr Bangerskiy. [passage omitted]

MN: Mr. Director-General, you know, of course, that our people's deputies are going to take the most active part in discussing the state budget of the USSR, including spending on international programmes. Some people's deputies believe that several regions in our country cannot be seen as developed and, consequently, are in need of international aid. Therefore, it is not the USSR that must finance—on a par with developed Western nations—the programmes of aid to other countries, our own country must itself be given such aid. Is UNESCO prepared for this?

Mayor: Personally, I don't think that the Soviet Union (if we consider, for instance, the organization in it of higher education and other indicators) can be referred to as a developing nation. And it is not in my province to decide what kind of a nation this or that country is. If people believe that the USSR gets less from UNESCO than it invests in this organization, I would like to say the following. Such possibilities as international exchanges or involvement in international scientific cooperation cannot be appraised in terms of money. Many of UNESCO's programmes cannot be judged on the basis of their economic profitability, because the questions of culture and spiritual life in general can hardly be calculated in money terms. Moreover, we mustn't proceed in our appraisals from the immediate returns, we must wait for long-term results. What return on its investments in UNESCO has the Soviet Union received? It was in a position to take an active part in international exchanges in the framework of our programmes, with openings being offered to it on other approaches to the problems of this world. I believe that the possibilities UNESCO's assistance opened up to the Soviet Union have contributed to the changes going on there today.

MN: You must understand what has given rise to our interest in this problem. Of course, people's deputies do not cast aspersion on the need for the USSR's contribution, including financial, to the programmes of UNESCO or other organizations. But many of them believe that the Soviet Union has many problems which our country cannot tackle today without international assistance. And, therefore, the question arises of aid to

the Soviet Union along UNESCO's lines, for instance, in the realm of preserving the monuments of world culture and architecture, many of which are in a lamentable state in our country.

Mayor: Concerning the architectural monuments, which your vast country is so rich in, when it comes to world masterpieces, these works—in accordance with a convention which the USSR has ratified—are included in a corresponding UNESCO list and are no longer the heritage of the Soviet Union alone, but of the world community. In this case UNESCO must deal with maintaining and restoring these monuments by financing corresponding projects.

Regarding monuments of national significance, even here UNESCO, with its highly qualified experts, can help in their classification, assessment and in the choice of whatever must be saved first. [passage omitted]

Comments on Soviet Participation

18070710 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
20 Jul 89 First Edition p 5

[Article by M. Kozhukhov: "F. Mayor: 'Tomorrow is Always Late'"]

[Text] **The official visit to the USSR of Federico Mayor, director general of UNESCO is continuing. On 18 July he was received by I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. During the course of the conversations, questions were discussed concerning the participation of the USSR in the activity of UNESCO.**

F. Mayor met with journalists, among whom was an IZVESTIYA correspondent.

[Kozhukhov] Mr Mayor, this is not your first time in our country, and your present visit, very likely, will pursue specific objectives?

[Mayor] In fact, I have been in the Soviet Union three times at various forums; however, this visit is official, and its program includes meetings with the leadership of your country, which makes an enormous contribution to the activity of UNESCO. The scope of the development of this cooperation also provides for negotiations with Soviet scientists and the signing of an agreement on joint work in such important UNESCO spheres as human rights, problems of development, and environmental protection.

[Kozhukhov] Science is more frequently becoming an object of criticism rather than praise. But still: In what area of UNESCO activity is the contribution of Soviet scientists and educators most noticeable?

[Mayor] There are quite a few such areas. In particular, the participation of Soviet scientists brings concrete results in UNESCO programs for research on problems of the world's oceans, the development of communications, and the creation of a global satellite communications system. Cooperation will also be continued in such an important area as information science—knowledge of its "ABC's" will become a necessary condition in the training of modern man.

Finally, there is fruitful cooperation in the area of education. We are very interested in developing contacts with Moscow University, for example, in whose auditoriums students from countries of the "third world" are receiving professional training. There is also a new and very interesting project associated with the program of study on our continent of European languages. This program can become a help in the construction of a "common European home," whose residents could easily understand each other regardless of which of its "rooms" they were born in. It is possible that we should begin joint work on new school textbooks, to rid them of ideological stock phrases, depictions of an enemy, and the like: This can also be our contribution to the development of a common European culture....

[Kozhukhov] The title "superpower," which the Soviet Union possesses, unfortunately, does not rid our country of serious problems. In what measure could UNESCO activity contribute to their resolution?

[Mayor] Possibly you know about the specific assistance that UNESCO provided to eliminate the consequences of the terrible catastrophe that struck Armenia. This was, for example, geotectonic research conducted by an international collective of scientists, the results of whose work were made available to the USSR. In addition, UNESCO will build schools in the area hit by the earthquake.

I could cite other examples also, but this is what is important: UNESCO by itself cannot create science or culture, and it does not educate. This is done by scientists, artists, and educators, and we only help them in this. UNESCO's mission is to assist in program development, making the stock of human intellectual knowledge available to everyone, for only an educated person is free. We can be of benefit in the creation of conceptual approaches to the resolution of problems of each of the countries to promote a cultural dialogue, and to strengthen spiritual and intellectual solidarity. And this, from my standpoint, is an indispensable condition for the formation in your country of an open political system, based on the primacy of common human values.

[Kozhukhov] "Tomorrow Is Always Late" is the title of our book, which is issued in the USSR. Can this formulation be considered your motto?

[Mayor] Yes, if you wish. The situation in the world is such that we, and I am not talking about governments, but about all of us, no longer have the right to postpone any one of our common efforts until tomorrow. Because tomorrow really will be late.

United States & Canada

U.S. Reverts to 'Notorious' Reagan Defense Policy

LD2707191889 Moscow TASS in English 1856 GMT 27 Jul 89

[By TASS observer on military issues Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow July 27 TASS—Three categories of lethal weapons have been removed already from a list of Soviet and American nuclear-missile weapon systems. In accordance with the Soviet-American INF Treaty, the elimination of OTR-22 missiles was completed in the Soviet Union on July 26. Twenty days before Americans destroyed their last Pershing-1A missile. All Soviet medium-range ground-based cruise missiles were destroyed last autumn. The nuclear-missile weapon systems destroyed in accordance with the treaty would be more than enough to fully devastate Europe in case of an armed conflict.

Contrary to pessimistic forecasts of some Western politologists, all provisions of the INF Treaty are being implemented under strict on-site control. Practical realisation of the treaty confirms once again that reliable security of nations can be ensured only by political means, through concluding mutually acceptable agreements and lessening the nuclear war threat.

Unfortunately, it is too early to say that the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles has resolved all problems of European security. The United States and Britain are hatching plans of "compensating" for the missiles destroyed under the treaty with new, even more dangerous nuclear weapons. According to the American press, the United States continues to develop the strategy of a "preventive" nuclear strike on Soviet territory. The U.S. Administration requests the Congress to allocate billions of dollars to the "Star Wars" programme. The Pentagon insists on the deployment of 132 new B-2 Stealth bombers which, according to Washington, can deal a sudden blow at Soviet mobile missiles and command posts.

Despite the overall lessening of tension in the past few years, the White House is returning to the notorious concept of former President Reagan—to achieve disarmament through preliminary buildup of U.S. nuclear arsenals. The American side refuses to accept the proposal of socialist countries and to start talks on nuclear tactical weapons. Washington's previous statements on its readiness to agree to any verification and control over the observance of arms control agreements proved to have been made for propaganda purposes. For instance, the U.S. Administration categorically rejects reciprocal inspections on naval ships. The Pentagon maintains that no Soviet inspector will set foot on a U.S. naval ship.

A way to the consolidation of stability in Europe and the world in general turned out to be more difficult than it looked at the time of the signing and ratification of the INF Treaty. However, the number of defeats suffered by supporters of the policy of whipping up tension in international relations in the past three to four years exceeds by far the number of victories they won. This is a significant result of the spreading of new political thinking all over the world.

Results of Bush Visit to Hungary, Poland Assessed

PM2707160089 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 30, 23 Jul 89 p 3

[Andranik Migranyan article: "In the Wake of Bush's East European Visit"]

[Text] Reactions of all interested sides to the meeting held in Warsaw and Budapest by US President Bush indicate that Poland and Hungary are for the first time since the start of the cold war ceasing to be "frontline states" in the East-West confrontation. If this supposition is correct, one can perhaps speak of this confrontation moving into a new phase following progress in arms talks.

As I see it, the visit has really paved the way for a new pattern of Soviet-US and East-West relations. What's the basis for this conclusion?

I think the Bush visit confirmed that Washington still hopes to move Poland and Hungary into the Western orbit. For this reason it supports and tries to boost the image, influence and international prestige of forces opposing the Polish United Workers' Party and the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party. At the same time, Washington hesitates to bring about a headlong confrontation, despite what it regards as a situation in Poland and Hungary favourable to the West. This suggests a tentative conclusion that the US is interested in the stability of Poland and Hungary, and that it realizes the need for constructive national dialogue in these countries which would not destabilize the world climate. The official and opposition forces in Hungary and Poland also realize what roles they must play in developing relations between the USSR and the US, and East and West. For this reason the opposition forces in Poland and Hungary did not see the Bush visit as an opportunity to take the confrontation with their authorities and the Soviet Union a step further. I therefore think that all participants in the talks in Warsaw and Budapest displayed wisdom, tolerance and responsibility for their countries' future and the future of the world political climate.

According to some Western opinions, the president's visit would irritate the Soviet Union allegedly because the US would take advantage of the situation in Poland and Hungary to ensure unilateral gains in these countries at the expense of Soviet interests. These opinions are the clear results of old cold war dogmas which view Eastern Europe as a place where the superpowers battled for

domination, where the West and, particularly the US, are trying to wrest countries from the socialist system in violation of the Yalta agreements.

From this point of view, the USSR should have been really nervous about the hearty welcome accorded to the American president by all the political forces in Hungary and Poland. But Moscow wasn't and isn't nervous at all. This proves that the US president's recent visit and the welcome he received are viewed by Moscow as fitting into the new pattern of world and especially Soviet-American relations. Under the circumstances Moscow is closely watching developments, and proceeds from the fact that there hardly exist in Washington or anywhere else in the West politicians who could seriously consider a prospect of wresting a socialist country from the East European military, political and economic structures. And thereby upsetting the balance of forces on the continent, destabilizing both the political situation in countries of Eastern Europe and the entire system of world relations.

Poland and Hungary are close to completing modernization of their socio-economic and political systems. My feeling is they are ahead of the Soviet Union in some respects in this regard. The Soviet Union has only recently stated a complete modernization of its society. Embarking on the same road, the Soviet Union guarantees as it were the continuation of the renewal processes in Hungary and Poland. Moscow is closely watching these processes to see what positive modernization experience it can use.

Renewal processes in the Soviet Union, Poland and Hungary are interconnected and are of much more positive value for the future of the world community than any attempts to tip the balance of forces in Eastern Europe to harm the Soviet Union's geopolitical interests. Does not the real meaning of the US president's visit to Poland and Hungary lie in the recognition of this truth?

Norfolk Welcomes USSR Navy Visitors

PM2707135789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch: "'This Must Happen Much More Often'"]

[Text] Norfolk (Virginia), 25 Jul—"Glasnost Has Come to Norfolk"—this banner headline in the local newspaper THE VIRGINIAN-PILOT conveys the unusual nature of the past 5 days for the port city on the Atlantic coast.

There really never has been such a thing. The Soviet cruiser "Marshal Ustinov," the destroyer "Otlichnyy," and the tanker "Genrikh Gasanov," attached to the Northern Fleet, have made a goodwill visit here, to the world's largest naval complex, the command center of the U.S. Atlantic 2d Fleet. For the first time in the history of Soviet-U.S. relations warships of one great power have visited not a civilian port in the other power but a military base. Such an event undoubtedly attests to the positive changes really occurring, albeit slowly, in what is probably the most complex and dangerous sphere of our cooperation.

On the pier I got into conversation with Seaman Todd Olsen [name as transliterated]. "Peace has to begin somewhere. And this visit serves precisely as part of the establishment of peace. I am definitely proud that we are receiving them here," Todd replied.

Captain 2d Rank Yurchanov, deputy commander for political affairs of the "Marshal Ustinov," is convinced of the need to switch from the policy of force to a policy of friendship, mutual understanding, and cooperation. In his opinion, the visit to Norfolk confirms the possibility of reestablishing military parity at a lower level. "Enough of looking at each other through viewfinders and sights. It is time to switch to arranging mutual understanding and cooperation," he remarked.

I put one and the same question to Admiral J. Johnson, commander of the U.S. 2d Fleet, and to Vice Admiral I. Kasatonov, commander of the Soviet formation: You have been schooled to see each other at least as a potential enemy. Is your view changing now?

The replies essentially coincided. "We do not consider the Americans enemies but see them as partners with whom we must converse," Kasatonov said. "This is a historic visit, a unique opportunity to establish a dialogue which will, hopefully, help to reduce tension," Johnson replied.

...Throughout these days the residents of Norfolk have formed kilometer-long lines to visit the Soviet ships. Our seamen gave them a hospitable welcome. "This must happen much more often. It is high time. They are very friendly, really friendly." These words by Bob Browler [name as transliterated], a seaman electronics expert, could, I believe, perfectly well serve as an epigraph to the meetings on Norfolk soil.

China

Further Reports on Visit of PRC's Tian Jiyun

Tour of Leningrad Detailed

PM2707111389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Visit to Leningrad"]

[Text] Leningrad, 24 Jul—A PRC Government delegation headed by Tian Jiyun, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo and vice premier of the PRC State Council, today concluded its stay in the city on the Neva.

The guests laid flowers at the monument to V.I. Lenin outside the Smolnyy. Red carnations were also laid at the monument to Leningrad's heroic defenders in Victory Square. The delegation visited the "Severnaya Verf" shipyard and went on board the cruiser "Avrora."

Briefing on Reforms in Ukraine

PM2707142589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "PRC Delegation in the Ukraine"]

[Text] Kiev, 25 Jul—M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the PRC and his meetings and talks in Beijing opened up new opportunities for the consistent broadening and deepening of Soviet-Chinese ties in the interests of both peoples. This was pointed out during talks at the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers with Tian Jiyun, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo and vice premier of the PRC State Council. He heads the PRC delegation visiting our country in connection with its participation in the fourth session of the Soviet-Chinese Commission for Economic, Trade, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation.

In the course of comradely talks the guest was briefed on how the economic reform is being implemented in the republic, which possesses considereable industrial, agricultural, and scientific potential, and how the new management methods are helping to accelerate the restructuring processes.

The Chinese guests visited the head plant of the S.P. Korolev Production Association and the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Problems on Materials Technology. During a trip to the Crimea the delegation members were familiarized with the work of the "Massandra" Agrarian Production Association.

Delegation Leaves Moscow 27 Jul

LD2707220789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1926 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jul (TASS)—Today a Chinese delegation led by Tian Jiyun, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo and deputy premier of the PRC State Council, left Moscow. The delegation took part in the fourth session of the Soviet-Chinese commission on economic, trade, and scientific and technical cooperation.

At the airport the delegation was seen off by Yu.D. Maslyukov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials.

Among those seeing off the delegation was Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR. On the same day the guests visited the "Scientific Center" Association in Zelenograd.

Results of USSR-PRC Economic Cooperation Session

PM2807100989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In the Interests of Cooperation"]

[Text] The fourth sitting of the Soviet-Chinese Commission for Economic, Trade, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation ended in Moscow 26 July with the signing of a protocol. The document was signed by Yu.D. Maslyukov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the Soviet side of the commission, and Tian Jiyun, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo, deputy premier of the PRC State Council, and chairman of the Chinese side of the commission.

In the spirit of the principled accords reached during the Soviet-Chinese summit meeting, the commission sitting comprehensively examined questions of the further development of economic, trade, scientific, and technical cooperation between the two countries.

The in-depth exchange of opinions on the draft program for long-term economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the USSR and the PRC through the year 2000 was continued, and an accord was reached to complete coordination of the program by the end of 1989 and submit it to the chairmen of the commission's national sides.

There was a discussion of questions concerning the expansion of cooperation between the two countries in the spheres of power engineering, including nuclear power engineering, railway transportation and subway building, ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy, the coal, timber, and light industries, agriculture, medicine and health care services, and others.

A special place at the sitting was occupied by questions of galvanizing cooperation between the two countries in the production of industrial consumer goods by organizing the processing of raw materials supplied by the Soviet Union for Chinese enterprises to boost their deliveries to the Soviet Union and broaden the range of commodities delivered to the USSR. A permanent working group on consumer goods was set up to coordinate all the work in this sphere.

The sitting also examined in detail questions associated with the preparation of a draft intergovernmental agreement on the recruitment and utilization of Chinese manpower in the USSR and the improvement of the mechanism of border and interregional ties between the two countries; and it summed up the results of cooperation in the spheres of foreign trade, contractual construction work, science and technology, planning activity, and education and mapped out specific avenues for its development.

The commission's fifth sitting is scheduled to be held in Beijing next spring.

CPC's Jiang Cited on Reforms, Party Building
PM2707081989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Jiang Zemin on Party Building"]

[Text] Beijing, 24 Jul—While reforms are being implemented in China and the policy of expanding ties is being pursued with the outside world all party organizations must regard questions of party building as of paramount importance in all their work, an article by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, published in the latest issue of the journal DANGJIAN states. At the present stage in the development of socialist building, according to the CPC leader, this is most important and urgent and also relates to the problem of strengthening the party's leading role in all the socioeconomic and political transformations under way in the country.

Questions of party building, the article points out, embrace a relatively wide range of very serious and urgent tasks. These include, in particular, the clear-cut observance by communists of statutory requirements and party discipline and the strengthening of the entire party's role and prestige.

An extremely important problem on the agenda today, the CPC Central Committee general secretary writes, is that of ensuring the purity of party ranks and state personnel and fighting corruption. Much depends on cadre policy, as well as the state of ideological-political work. Under present conditions the forms and methods of ideological-political education do not accord with the existing situation.

Concerning doubts as to the correctness of the country's present political course, Jiang Zemin writes, in particular, that certain people put questions regarding the expediency of the spread of Marxism in China, the correctness of the choice of the socialist path of development after the formation of the PRC, and also the policy of reforms and of expanding ties with the outside world. A clear-cut reply must be given to this, the CPC leader points out. The spread of Marxism was an important condition in preparing for the CPC's creation. After the revolution's victory the people themselves made their choice—to build socialism. The opinions of workers and peasants should be taken into consideration as we implement reforms and the policy of expanding ties with the outside world. "I am afraid that no one will want to return to the old way, namely to the old life that existed prior to 1978," Jiang Zemin writes.

Agreement Reached To Open Sino-Soviet Railway
LD2707201989 Moscow TASS in English 1942 GMT 27 Jul 89

[By TASS special correspondent Sergey Kulik]

[Text] Urumchi (China) July 27 TASS—An agreement has been reached here to implement plans for linking the Soviet and Chinese railway networks in the western direction and to open, in the middle of 1992, international communication through the Druzhba-Alashankou border crossing. The plans envisage the construction of a new 210 km-long railway stretch to link the Usu station on the Chinese territory with the borderline between the two countries and the modernization of the Aktogai-Druzhba railroad in Soviet Kazakhstan. These will enable trains to run along the Alma-Ata-Urumchi line to make the overall Moscow-Beijing route shorter by 10 per cent.

During the talks between the Soviet and the Chinese delegations, it was noted that, as a result of normalized relations between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic and practical perspectives for their consolidation, as well as favorable perspectives for the development of world international cooperation, an opportunity has arisen to re-evaluate the significance of the Druzhba-Alashankou crossing. Under new conditions, it will provide the concluding link in the great rail way running along the same route as the ancient silk way which used to be the pivot of trade and cultural exchanges among the countries of Eurasia. A 12,000 km-long London-Moscow-Shanghai-Hong Kong railroad project is nearing completion. It will provide a direct transcontinental link between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans.

Linkage of the Soviet and Chinese railway networks will facilitate not only the development of economic and cultural relations in the border areas of the two countries and the re-routing of part of the load from the railroad connecting the Soviet Union and China in the Far East, but also, in the perspective, the expansion of trade and cultural exchanges between the countries of Asia, the Pacific, Europe and the Middle East. Freight shipped along the Transcaucasian railroad will take twice as little time to reach destination as that travelling along sea-routes.

The protocol signed here notes that the creation of the great railroad will considerably facilitate access to numerous historical and cultural monuments of the middle and central Asia. This will in turn stimulate the intensive development of tourism in the Soviet and Chinese regions which previously used to be so difficult of access. In this way, weighty contribution will be made to the implementation of the UNESCO project "The Great Silk Way." The project is devised to familiarize mankind, within the coming five-year period, with civilizations of this immense area and thus help promote East-West dialogue and mutual understanding.

NOVOYE VREMYA Cited on Recent Beijing Incidents

OW2707004389 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1300 GMT 17 Jul 89

[From the "World Today" program]

[Text] The weekly magazine NOVOYE VREMYA published an article entitled "Test." Following are the excerpts from the article.

China experienced another test not long ago. The country shed the blood of its own people. The incident is over. No one can undo what was done. Those who died cannot be restored to life. Considerations should be devoted to those who are still alive and to the question of what should be done in the future. It is a serious issue.

Records of incidents in the past are readily available in our archives. The incident which occurred in Tbilis not long ago, the firing on demonstrating workers who held high red banners and the execution of seven demonstrators, including one woman, in Novocherkassk City in 1962, and other incidents give us no right to condemn others. Indeed, such incidents should not happen in a civilized society. The occurrence of such incidents in whatever part of the world—Europe, Africa, Oceania, or Asia—and in whatever social system, is regrettable. However, we are not prepared to busy ourselves in throwing stones at others.

At present, China is in a difficult situation. Above all, it is hoped that the process of deepening reform will not be interrupted in this great country. Therefore, we closely follow the development of the situation in China. We are sorry that crackdown measures are being taken there. We have heard sad news that scores of people have already been executed and nearly 2,000 people were arrested in Shanghai, Beijing, and some other cities. Among them, some were sentenced to long-term imprisonment. I think that cruel and harsh measures, such as execution, usually adopted to intimidate people, may enrage them and cause tension in society. Of course, every country has its own laws. As the proverbial saying goes, no one can appraise the temple of other people by the standards of his own gods.

China and the Soviet Union are two neighboring countries. Whatever happens in neighboring countries evokes repercussions in our country. This is not only proceeding from the viewpoint of all mankind. Furthermore, whatever happens in China is a matter of great concern to the Soviet Union. The latest situation shows that we cannot guarantee that demonstrations by the masses will not happen. The Soviet people are very sorry about the tragedy in Tiananmen Square. No matter who is right and who is wrong, it is a tragedy to all mankind. No matter how the incident is interpreted and understood in China, what is of primary importance is that the leaders of the party and the state can find solutions in the interests of the Chinese people and meet our common expectations. We believe that dialogue and reform give hope that stability and happiness will be restored in China.

Northeast Asia

Further Reportage on Visit by MPR's Batmonh

Holds Talks With Gorbachev

LD2707154989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting Between M.S. Gorbachev and J. Batmonh"]

[Text] On 26 July Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, met with Jambyn Batmonh, general secretary of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee, chairman of the Presidium of the Mongolian People's Republic [MPR] People's Great Hural, who is in the Soviet Union on a working visit.

At the center of attention was an exchange of information and views on vital questions of Soviet-Mongolian cooperation and the international situation.

Describing the internal political situation in the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that restructuring has perhaps entered the most difficult phase of development. The politicization of society is developing rapidly. An unusual many-sidedness of conflicting interests, hopes and criticism, expectations and efforts has broadly risen to the level of public awareness. But the common denominator of our days is the same—the demand of labor collectives and the country's aware citizens to more resolutely and efficiently renew all spheres of public life. Hence the exclusive significance of responsibility and realism in all links of the public organism.

This puts the CPSU in a new situation. To overcome lagging behind the demands of the times, to really be the vanguard of society, it must speed up its own renewal and democratization in its ranks. Nobody has the right to simply sit it out in study trenches. It is important to bring to the forefront of political work people who are truly active, who carry authority among the working people and who are capable of conducting with them a dialogue which is open and which brings results. The main prerequisite for forward movement on the difficult but vitally important road of restructuring now lies in this.

Jambyn Batmonh talked about the decisions of the latest plenums of the MPRP Central Committee which determined a program of imminent changes in Mongolian society. It is a matter of giving up command-style administrative methods, broadening democracy in economic and political life, beginning a true appraisal of the historic path of the party and the country, and renewing

the entire spiritual sphere. Far from everything is turning out right and quite a few difficulties have to be overcome. But communists and the working people of the MPR are aware of the need for changes.

Having expressed interested understanding for the concerns and plans of the Mongolian comrades, Mikhail Gorbachev wished them success in implementing the course for restructuring which takes into account both the experience of other socialist countries and the national and historic originality of the Mongolian People's Republic.

They noted that the principled community of approaches of the CPSU and the MPRP to socialist renewal broadens the possibilities for improving cooperation between the USSR and the MPR, which rests on the foundations of the traditional friendship between the Soviet and Mongolian peoples and the principles of equality and mutual respect. It will be necessary to vigorously eliminate everything that hinders this, and to seek maximum returns from the mutual ties. The basis for fruitful interaction will continue to be the close comradeliness between the two fraternal parties which has substantially deepened and enriched itself over the last few years.

A great deal of attention was devoted to the prospects for interaction between the Soviet Union and Mongolia in the sphere of economic relations. Principled mutual understanding was achieved on the substantial modification of the structure of cooperation and on the restructuring of its mechanism with account being taken of mutual interests. The necessary amplifications will be considered by the competent state bodies during the coordination of the national economic plans of the USSR and the MPR for 1991-1995 and up to the year 2000.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Jambyn Batmonh agreed that the party bodies, ideological and other estabishments of the two countries could implement more actively and with greater return a long-term program of deepening cooperation between the CPSU and the MPRP in the field of ideology, culture, science, and education. The possibilities which exist here should be more fully utilized and there should be a quicker response to the requirements of life.

A discussion of international issues reaffirmed the two countries' unity of approaches in assessing the developing situation in the world. Jambyn Batmonh spoke of Mongolia's support for the fundamental ideas and approaches which were expressed in the documents of the Bucharest conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states. He noted the important stabilizing significance of the results of the Soviet-Chinese summit talks for the development of the situation in Asia. A strengthening of stability and good-neighborliness and mutually advantageous cooperation in this vast area of the world fully meets Mongolia's interests and aspirations. Mikhail Gorbachev welcomed the MPR's creative contribution to the broadening of a bilateral and multilateral political and public dialogue on the Asian Continent and to the affirmation of the principles of the nonuse of force in relations between the Asian and Pacific Ocean states.

The conversation passed in an atmosphere of cordiality and comradely mutual understanding characteristic of Soviet-Mongolian relations.

The same day a dinner was given in the Great Kremlin Palace in J. Batmonh's honor on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee.

Present with the guest were the Mongolian officials accompanying him on his trip.

Mikhail Gorbachev, Nikolay Ryzhkov, Eduard Shevardnadze, Aleksandr Yakovlev, Viktor Nikonov, and other officials were at the dinner.

Tours 'Ramenskiy' Combine

PM2807103389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Working Visit"]

[Text] Workers at the "Ramenskiy" Agro-Industrial Combine fraternally welcomed the Mongolian leader with bread and salt 27 July. J. Batmonh, general secretary of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee and chairman of the Mongolian People's Republic [MPR] Great People's Hural Presidium, began the day with a visit to this major multisector enterprise outside Moscow.

K.B. Kunitskiy, general director of the agro-industrial combine, described how "Ramenskiy" operates in conditions of full economic accountability. A net profit of more than R50 million was earned here last year. The combine has funds to improve working conditions and to develop the social sphere. Taking advantage of the right to engage in autonomous foreign trade activity granted by the economic reform, the agro-industrial combine has concluded about 20 contracts with firms in Japan, the Netherlands, and a number of other countries. They cover equipment deliveries here.

The party influence exerted on the development of affairs by Communists in all enterprises and collective and state farms within the agro-industrial combine provided a separate topic of conversation. Interest was shown in the news that a council of "Ramenskiy" party organization secretaries has been set up here to coordinate all party work and to elaborate joint strategy.

The visitor toured various shops, looked at production lines for the processing and packaging of vegetable produce, and was shown around the meat processing plant and the dairy combine.

We are profoundly satisfied with the visit's results, J. Batmonh said in an interview with a TASS correspondent. The current meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which is a continuation of these traditional contacts in relations between our parties and countries, is especially important because it took place at a crucial time in the processes of renewal in both the USSR and the MPR, the guest went on to say. We follow with great interest the radical changes in the Soviet Union. Restructuring in our own country is implemented in conformity with our conditions and is also aimed at improving the socialist society. Therefore, the growing importance of mutual cooperation is understandable.

Assessing the present state of relations between the MPR and the USSR and between the MPRP and the CPSU, the Mongolian leader emphasized that they develop and strengthen with each passing day. In the present conditions, he went on to say, they are being enriched with new content and forms. This applies to cooperation between the parties and to ties in the spheres of the economy, science, technology, and other spheres. Reliance on broad collaboration with the USSR is unquestionably important for socialist building in the MPR.

Assesses Bilateral Relations

LD2807021089 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1830 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jul (TASS)—We are deeply satisfied with the results of our working visit to the USSR, stated Jambyn Batmonh, general secretary of the Mongolia People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee and chairman of the Great People's Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic (MPR). He gave an interview here today to Soviet and Mongolian journalists. The Mongolian leader stressed that his meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev is of particularly great importance, for it took place at a critical time, when processes of renewal are taking place both in the USSR and in the MPR. Restructuring in Mongolia, implemented in conformity with domestic conditions, is also directed toward the improvement of socialist society.

Assessing the present state of relations between the MPR and the USSR, and between the MPRP and the CPSU, Jambyn Batmonh said that they are being enriched with new content. Nevertheless, there are no foundations for saying that we have exploited all reserves of interaction, remarked the Mongolian leader. It is for this very reason that in the talk with Mikhail Gorbachev basic attention was paid to issues of actively improving the forms of mechanisms of bilateral cooperation.

Talking on the positive shifts on the international arena, Jambyn Batmonh said that new political thinking is gaining further recognition and this is an important condition for strengthening peace and security.

Mentioning the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the MPR, the first stage of which was completed in 1987, the Mongolian leader remarked that it was being implemented successfully. In 1989-90 the greater part of the remaining troops will be withdrawn from the territory of Mongolia. We are convinced, underlined Jambyn Batmonh, that this is a concrete profound contribution by the two countries to consolidating the spirit of mutual trust and cooperation in Asia and in the Far East.

Departs Moscow 28 Jul

LD2807060589 Moscow TASS in English 0541 GMT 28 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 28 TASS—Mongolian leader Jambyn Batmonh departed from Moscow today. He stayed in the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee on a working visit.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Cambodian Peace

LD2807094789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "E.A. Shevardnadze's Answers to TASS Diplomatic Correspondent's Questions"]

[Text] There follows an interview granted to a TASS diplomatic correspondent by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze:

Question: Eduard Amvrosiyevich, you will attend an international conference on Cambodia, which opens in Paris on July 30. Which place does the problem of a Cambodian settlement occupy among priorities for Soviet foreign policy?

Answer: We give this problem heightened attention. Grave tribulations that befell Cambodian people during the time of Pol Pot's genocide make it morally one of the overriding tasks of the international community to achieve peace and calm in that country.

Politically, it is very important to develop the trend towards regional settlements, dating from the accords on Afghanistan. The turnpike in this area has been found. It is resolving domestic aspects of a settlement on the basis of a national reconciliation policy and external aspects by way of international agreements.

The resolution of the Cambodian problem will make it possible to remove one of the longest-standing irritants from international affairs. This also applies to our dialogue with a number of countries.

It is symbolic for us that the conference is convened exactly 3 years after Mikhail Gorbachev put forward the Vladivostok program which placed questions of a regional settlement among the immediate problems in the Asian-Pacific region.

For all these years, Soviet diplomacy has vigorously worked towards this goal, including a Cambodian settlement, acting in close contact with our friends—the State of Cambodia, Vietnam and Laos.

We have conducted active and constructive dialogue on the Cambodian problem with many nations. We had important contacts with the People's Republic of China, during which a sphere of practical mutual understanding and agreement was discovered and subsequently substantially expanded.

Exchanges of opinions with ASEAN countries—Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia and Singapore—were extremely useful. These exchanges became especially dynamic after my visit to the region in 1987 and meetings and talks I had there.

Issues concerning a Cambodian settlement were invariably present on the agenda of our talks with the United States, France, Britain, Japan, Australia and many other countries.

Question: How do matters stand on the eve of the conference vis-a-vis a settlement?

Answer: The conference is being convened just as the settlement process has reached the decisive phase. A fundamentally new situation is shaping in Southeast Asia. What are its distinctive features?

First, Vietnamese volunteer forces will be completely withdrawn from Cambodia within the next 2 months. There is no doubt about it.

Second, much has been achieved as a result of two informal meetings of Cambodian sides with the participation of the region's states in Jakarta and dialogue between Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen and Prince Norodom Sihanouk.

I must also note efforts by many members of the world community assisting in the resolution of the Cambodian conflict.

The Nonaligned Movement, including such members as India, Zimbabwe and Yugoslavia, played a positive role for all these years. And, of course, we should give its due to France which initiated the Paris conference.

Question: What are the main tasks that the conference is to resolve, in your mind?

Answer: It is primarily to concentrate on working out measures to avert a civil war and prevent the restoration of a genocidal regime in Cambodia in any form after the pullout of foreign troops, the cut off of foreign military aid to all conflicting Cambodian sides, and the adoption of international guarantees on Cambodia's status as an independent, peaceful, neutral and nonaligned state.

After the Cambodian sides hammer out accords on domestic aspects, the conference could come up with guarantees for their realization. Naturally enough, one of the important tasks facing the conference is to create effective international monitoring and verification mechanisms.

But today the real situation is as follows: The interested parties have made significant headway and are practically close to coming to terms on the above issues, which make up the external aspects of the settlement.

Domestic aspects, starting from the first step—a ceasefire—are a toughter proposition. The Cambodian sides certainly have the decisive role to play in resolving them. This is a matter of principle, which bears on the sovereign rights of Cambodians.

But, of course, the participants in the conference cannot be indifferent to how things fare in this area. They are entitled to facilitate correspondingly favorable conditions and search for compromise options at the inter-Khmer talks. Good advice from them will not harm anybody, and may even assist in the settlement.

Question: It is clear from what you said that the conference has a difficult mission. Where do you think the key to its success lies, to a positive outcome?

Answer: I would say that very much will depend on the goodwill of the Khmer sides and their awareness of their responsibility for the fate of their fatherland.

If they demonstrate this, any task, no matter how challenging, will be manageable. The best variant, of course, would be an agreement on the entire range of problems connected with a Cambodian settlement, during one meeting. As a minimum, the Paris conference should place Cambodia firmly on a political settlement track.

Question: Do you plan to hold separate meetings with other participants in the conference, considering the fact that representatives of more than 20 countries are expected in Paris?

Answer: The Paris conference is planned to open at the foreign minister level, which by itself indicates that this will be a major international forum. To be sure, I intend to avail myself of the opportunity to continue contacts with my colleagues.

Meetings are planned with representatives of Cambodia, Vietnam, Laos, ASEAN states, permanent members of the Security Council, Japan, Canada, Australia, Zimbabwe and Yugoslavia. It is possible that there will also be others.

The conference will also be attended by U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar. His presence underlines the importance of the Paris forum. We count on a meeting with him.

Question: Will you also meet with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker? You know that there is a special interest in Soviet-American contacts. What can you say about this meeting?

Answer: It will for us be one "over and above the plan" and this will evidently determine its nature. Understandably, we shall talk on the themes of the Paris conference. But apart from this, we plan to use it for a tentative discussion of issues to be included on the agenda of our "regular" meeting in Washington in mid-September.

I think that in this way we will be able to increase the intensity of the Soviet-American dialogue.

Preliminary Cambodian Peace Talks Held in Paris
PM2707152589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Own Correspondent Yu. Kovalenko report: "Meetings at the Chateau La Celle Saint Cloud"]

[Text] Paris—A meeting was held on Monday at the Chateau La Celle Saint Cloud near Paris between Hun Sen, head of government of the State of Cambodia, and opposition leader Prince Norodom Sihanouk. On Tuesday talks began there among all four sides involved in the conflict: Hun Sen and Norodom Sihanouk were joined by the representatives of Son Sann's group and Pol Pot's Khmers Rouges.

On 30 July, a few days after the talks end, an international conference on Cambodia will open in the French capital in which, according to the local press, the four Khmer sides will be joined by Vietnam, Laos, the six ASEAN countries, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, Australia, Japan, India, Canada, a delegation representing the nonaligned countries, and the UN secretary general. Thus the decisive stage in the settlement of the long-running Cambodian conflict is beginning.

The meeting at the Chateau La Celle Saint Cloud produced no concrete results. Furthermore, at the press conference held after the meeting, Hun Sen stated that Norodom Sihanouk is undermining the progress achieved at the previous talks when the two leaders agreed to the "linkage" of two goals—the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops from Cambodia and the prevention of the Pol Pot regime's return to power. It is possible that some positive elements will emerge at the quadripartite talks, whose results will influence the course of the upcoming conference. Its main task is to formulate guarantees safeguarding Cambodia's existence as an independent, neutral, and nonaligned state and the creation of the corresponding control mechanism for that purpose. "We advocate a global solution," Hun Sen stressed.

Does the holding of the Paris conference on Cambodia mean that the main obstacles to a settlement have been removed? Of course not.

The key aspects are the withdrawal of foreign troops, ending military aid to the opposing groupings, preventing the restoration of the Pol Pot regime, and preventing the outbreak of civil war. N. Sihanouk insists on the Pol Pot supporters' participation in a national unity government, claiming that only thus can Cambodian stability and independence be "guaranteed," because if the Khmers Rouges remain outside its framework they will present a "deadly danger" to the country.

The press here is writing that Sihanouk proposes that the armed forces of each of the four sides be reduced to 10,000 men. But that, in the opinion of observers, will give an opportunity to the Khmers Rouges, who possess considerable military strength, to wage a power struggle.

Furthermore, the opposition is demanding that the present state structures be dismantled. The prince has published a whole series of documents, signed by the three opposition leaders, including a draft constitution which provides for the election of a president by universal suffrage for a term of 7 years (N. Sihanouk does not object to running for the office of head of state) and the creation of a bicameral parliament. However, a disruption of the existing state system, observers point out, is fraught with dangerous consequences.

Cambodia's Declaration of Neutrality Reported
PM2607110989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Cambodia Declares Neutrality"]

[Text] Phnom Penh, 22 July—The National Assembly of the State of Cambodia has solemnly declared its permanent neutrality, a statement by the news agency SPK, circulated here, says.

Having endured the horrors of genocide and destruction unprecedented in human history, caused by decades of war, the Cambodian people intend to live in conditions of peace and national consensus and to build a happy new life.

Wishing to make a contribution to the work of peace, stability, and cooperation in Southeast Asia, the National Assembly of Cambodia solemnly declares permanent neutrality, stipulating:

1. Cambodia will implement the principle of peaceful coexistence and develop friendly and cooperative relations with all countries, whatever their sociopolitical system, on the basis of equality, respect for independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity, noninterference in internal affairs, the nonuse of violence, the peaceful resolution of conflicts, and respect for mutual interests.

2. Cambodia will not enter into any military alliances and will not join any agreements directed against its neutrality. It will not allow any army or foreign military base to be stationed on its territory. And it will not allow any other power to use Cambodian territory for interference in the internal affairs of a third country.

3. Cambodia reserves the right to defend its independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and permanent neutrality by all the means stipulated in the UN Charter and by the principles of the Nonaligned Movement.

This National Assembly declaration on permanent neutrality is guaranteed by the Cambodian Constitution and comes into force from the moment when the declaration is made.

Neutrality Decision 'Historic'

PM2607160189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[Petr Tsvetov "Correspondent's Commentary": "Declaration of Neutrality"]

[Text] Phnom Penh, 24 Jul—Cambodia is once again the center of world attention. There are substantial reasons for this. A meeting was held in Paris today between Hun Sen, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the State of Cambodia, and Prince Norodom Sihanouk, leader of the opposition. It is to be followed by a "roundtable" involving the four Cambodian sides and, at the end of July, an international conference on Cambodia is going to start. These events could play a decisive role in settling this prolonged regional conflict.

In Phnom Penh itself, on the eve of these important events, a session of the country's National Assembly and an international seminar to discuss the phenomenon of Pol Pot's genocide were held almost simultaneously.

The seminar mustered an impressive array of participants, more than 100 people in all: legal experts, scientists, journalists, and cultural figures from various countries on four continents—Asia, Europe, America, and Australia. Prominent representatives of the Khmer emigre population were also present. Both the session and the seminar served to prepare the Cambodian government for the meeting in Paris.

The session approved 11 acts of state. They are concerned with the new status of a number of ministries, Cambodia's foreign economic ties, military service, the criminal code, and legislation on marriage and the family. But the main document is the solemnly adopted Declaration of Permanent Neutrality of the State of Cambodia. As stated in the declaration, the State of Cambodia will adhere to the principles of peaceful coexistence, develop relations of friendship and cooperation with all countries, regardless of their political and social system, and resolve all disputes peacefully, on the basis of consideration for mutual interests. Cambodia pledges to refrain from membership in military alliances contrary to its neutral status and will not allow any bloc to set up bases on its territory or use it to intervene in the internal affairs of other countries.

Assessing the declaration, we can speak of a return to the national political tradition, but at a qualitatively new level. In the fifties and sixties, when the country, as now, was officially named the State of Cambodia, it was also considered neutral. But its neutrality was crushed by U.S. aggression in Indochina. Adopting the declaration on the eve of the international conference in Paris makes it possible for its participants and the whole world community to recognize Cambodia's neutral status in perpetuity. In any event, it is a document of historic significance.

The declaration of the establishment of permanent neutrality, the Vietnamese newspaper QUAN DOI NHAN DAN wrote in its commentary, together with the decision to completely withdraw the Vietnamese volunteers from Cambodia in September this year and also the Jakarta accords are important elements in the task of achieving a political settlement of the situation in the region. The Vietnamese public expresses the hope that the participants in the forthcoming international conference on Cambodia in Paris will consider present realities and show respect for the Cambodian people's right to independently resolve their internal problems without outside interference.

Philippine President Favors Expanding Relations

HK2707032589 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Text] Philippine President Corazon Aquino favors the improvement of political and economic ties, not only with the United States and Japan, but other countries as well, including the Soviet Union. She spoke at a press conference in Manila.

In relation to her forthcoming visit to the USSR, she said that the enhancement of ties is necessary not only for economic reasons, i.e. tapping new markets, but also in order for the leaders of the two countries to get to know each other well.

SRV Delegation Makes Stopover in Moscow

PM2707153389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] An SRV delegation headed by Vo Chi Cong, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo and chairman of Vietnam's Council of State, stopped over in Moscow 25-26 July on its way home from Managua. The delegation was on an official friendly visit to Nicaragua and took part in celebrations to mark the 10th anniversary of the Sandinist people's revolution.

Near East & South Asia

Arab Leaders Briefed on Arms Deal With Iran

JN2707171689 Kuwait AL-QABAS in Arabic
26 Jul 89 pp 1, 20

[Unattributed report from Paris]

[Text] High ranking Arab sources have revealed to AL-QABAS that the Soviet leadership has informed some prominent Arab states and figures that it did not conclude a major arms deal with Iran that could disrupt the military balance in the region or destablize the Arab Gulf region. The Soviet leadership explained to them in particular that the Soviet Union will not supply Iran with sophisticated offensive weapons, but with only certain limited defensive weapons. AL-QABAS has learned that these clarifications were officially made during recent contacts and meetings between Soviet and senior Arab officials, including Iraqi and Gulf officials. During the meetings, which were held with complete frankness, the Arab side expressed dissatisfaction with the new Soviet orientation toward Iran. Arab League Secretary General Chedli Klibi also took part in the meetings.

According to high-ranking Arab sources, AL-QABAS reveals the details of this important issue as well as the continuing Arab-Soviet dialogue over the Moscow-Tehran military cooperation. Following the visit by Hojjat ol-Eslam 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, Iranian parliament speaker and presidential candidate, to Moscow in late June—during which he signed a series of agreements with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, in particular an agreement that the Soviet Union would consolidate Iran's defensive capabilities—contacts and meetings were held in Moscow and Arab capitals between Soviet and senior Arab officials, including in particular officials from Iraq and two Gulf states. Chedli Klibi and other prominent Arab figures also attended the meetings, during which the Soviet officials affirmed to the Arab side the following basic points:

1. The Soviet Union did not conclude a major arms deal with Iran that could change the military balance in the Gulf region or lead to a new situation which could destablize the region.

2. The Soviet Union does not intend to supply Iran with sophisticated, offensive weapons or military hardware which would contribute to worsening the situation or would jeopardize the cease-fire between Iraq and Iran. The Soviet Union intends to supply Iran with only certain defensive weapons and in quantities that would not lead to any tangible change in the military balance in the region in favor of Iran. Hence, the Soviet Union was particularly concerned to use the phrase consolidating Iran's defensive capabilities [no quotation marks as published] in the joint communique that was issued on Hashemi-Rafsanani's talks with the Soviet officials.

3. Responding to this sensitive issue should not depend only on what Iranian officials say or what is leaked from Tehran sources. Iranian officials have made large requests for weapons and military hardware—far exceeding the amount the Soviets desire to supply. The Soviets are not ready to respond to all Iranian military requests. The Soviet Union takes into consideration the future of the situation in the Arab Gulf region and the future of relations with Iraq and the Arab states in general. It also takes into consideration the future military situation between Iraq and Iran. The Soviet Union will not take steps which could pose a real threat to Soviet-Arab relations or pose the threat of a new war in the region.

4. The growing new relationship between the USSR and Iran will not lead, according to the perspective and calculations of the Soviet leadership, to a reduction of the Soviet ties with allied and friendly Arab states in the military, economic, political, or diplomatic fields.

AL-QABAS has asked these Arab sources what the Soviets mean when they talk about their desire to supply Iran with defensive and not offensive weapons. The sources replied that this phrase means that the USSR will not supply Iran with sophisticated warplanes, heavy tanks, or medium- or long-range surface-to-surface missiles, for example, at least in the foreseeable future. In general, defensive weapons include surface-to-air missiles, antitank missiles, artillery, helicopters, training and transport planes, radar equipment, and the like.

However, it seems that judging from the Arab responses to these Soviet clarifications and explanations that key Arab states and parties have not been convinced of this Soviet attitude. Nay, these Arab states and parties have continued to view with extreme caution and doubt the new Soviet-Iranian relationship. Moreover, these states and parties, including Iraq, have continued to pose questions on this relationship.

AL-QABAS has learned that these Arab parties have replied to the Soviet clarifications, specifically affirming to Soviet officials the following points:

1. In supplying Iran with any type of weapon, whether defensive or offensive, the Soviet leadership is taking numerous risks, because such weapons are being given to a regime that has not so far signed a peace agreement with Iraq and that has continued to reject the implementation of UN Security Council resolution 598 in its entirety and in accordance with the sequence of its articles. Moreover, this regime has refused to honor the spirit of the resolution. Hence, there is a danger that such a arms deal, even if it were to involve the supply of limited quantities of weapons, will lead to Iranian intransigence in the peace negotiations with Iraq.

2. No one is threatening Iran. Nay, Iran has threatened and continues to threaten the security and stability of Iraq and the Arabian Gulf states. Iraq and the Gulf states

are seeking through various means to establish peaceful and good-neighborly ties with Iran—ties based on mutual respect and noninterference in internal affairs. However, the Iranian leadership has so far actually rejected this Iraqi and Gulf peace orientation. Therefore, some in the region fear that Iranian officials might interpret the Soviet decision to supply Tehran with weapons as encouragement to this policy, which has not so far undergone a real and actual change despite all that is being said.

3. For a superpower such as the USSR to strengthen and bolster the Iranian regime before it has actually and drastically changed its policy vis-a-vis the Arab states, particularly its neighbors, involves a big risk. Such an act is virtually tantamount to contributing directly or indirectly to endangering the security and stability of the Gulf.

4. A number of key Arab states inside and outside the Gulf region will not be content to see the Soviet leadership bolster and strengthen its ties with Iran and prop up the current Iranian regime in various spheres, whether such activity is intended to promote plans for the Afghan situation or internal Soviet circumstances regardless of the repercussions of such behavior on the situation in the region. Hence, these Arab sates will follow closely, with great interest and unmistakable caution, the development of Moscow-Tehran ties in various spheres. Moreover, these states will take the proper measures if a development materializes in these ties that might have negative effects on the Arab situation. Furthermore, these states may take measures to prevent the materialization of negative repercussions affecting the Arab states or some of them if the development of Soviet-Iranian ties moves in certain directions.

AL-QABAS has also learned that a key Arab quarter warned a senior Soviet official that the USSR's supplying weapons to Iran might obstruct efforts to improve relations between the USSR and Saudi Arabia and delay the restoration of diplomatic ties between Moscow and Riyadh.

Ryzhkov Meets With Iranian Minister Nabavi

PM2807113789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jul 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Conversation With Iranian Minister"]

[Text] On 27 July N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received in the Kremlin B. Nabavi, Iran's minister of heavy industry, who is in our country.

There was a detailed exchange of opinions on a wide range of questions on Soviet-Iranian relations in the light of the accords reached during the recent official friendly visit to the USSR of A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani, chairman of the Islamic Consultative Assembly of Iran, and enshrined in the joint documents. Here the need was noted to utilize to a greater degree than before the objective conditions stemming from factors of proximity and tradition to extend the spheres of Soviet-Iranian cooperation. Both sides expressed satisfaction that there has been a notable improvement in the atmosphere of bilateral relations and that mutual trust has increased.

N.I. Ryzhkov dwelt on the current directions of the political and socioeconomic transformations in the Soviet Union. In this connection particular note was made of the need to improve the forms and areas of economic cooperation between the USSR and Iran which already exist and to actively search for new ones.

B. Nabavi noted that Iran is following with great interest the process of perestroyka which has evolved in the USSR in all spheres of Soviet society's life. He expressed the conviction that the dynamic development of Soviet-Iranian trade and economic ties will help both states to solve the tasks facing them in modernizing the economy and raising the peoples' living standards.

There was a principled discussion of some specific areas of Soviet-Iranian cooperation.

K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations, and N. Heirani-Nobari, Iranian ambassador to the USSR, participated in the conversation, which took place in an amicable atmosphere and a spirit of mutual understanding.

Najibullah Sees Soviet POW-Release Delegation

PM2607150589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jul 89 First Edition p 3

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Oliynik dispatch: "'Nadezhda's' Mission"]

[Text] Kabul, 24 Jul—A delegation of the "Nadezhda" people's committee for the salvation of Soviet prisoners of war [POWs] is in Kabul. Afghan President Najibullah received it 23 July. The day before the delegation members toured the streets and squares of the Afghan capital. They saw with their own eyes the bloody traces of the war. At the "Dusti" kindergarten, which was constructed with USSR aid, the walls have been holed and the splinter-covered frames of children's cots can be seen through the smashed windows—the result of a rocket bombardment 2 days ago.

"Our people have a good tradition—we do not forget human kindness," said Afghan President Najibullah, warmly greeting the "Nadezhda" delegation members. "On behalf of all Afghans and myself personally let me convey the most profound gratitude and compassion to all Soviet mothers whose sons lost their lives for the freedom and independence of Afghanistan and to all those parents who are in the midst of a difficult search for their sons who are missing on Afghan territory. Our country and our government have previously done and are doing everything in our power to ensure that 'Nadezhda's' mission comes to a successful conclusion and Soviet soldiers languishing in captivity return home..."

Writer A. Prokhanov, journalist I. Andronov, and a soldier's mother, A. Semenova, told the president about the humane activity of the "Nadezhda" people's committee, their recent trip to Pakistan, and conversations with that country's leaders and certain leaders of the Afghan opposition. They dwelt in detail on the principles for the exchange of POWs elaborated in the course of these conversations and also via diplomatic channels whereby all POWs from the Afghan Army and the opposition forces must be released along with Soviet POWs.

In the course of a lengthy conversation with President Najibullah, which took place in a cordial and frank atmosphere, they discussed a number of specific questions linked with the further activity of the "Nadezhda" committee.

POW Release Group Finds 'Breakthrough' in Kabul

PM2807092189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[Report by PRAVDA and APN special correspondents A. Lukyanov and R. Budrin: "Glimmer of Hope. Search for Soviet Prisoners of War in Afghanistan"]

[Text] Kabul-Moscow, Jul—It has been 5 months since the last Soviet soldier left Afghanistan. Thousands of mothers and fathers had got their soldier sons back at last. Hence the great desire to bring back those who are not on the dead and returned lists.

"There has been a breakthrough in the difficult search for Soviet servicemen imprisoned in Afghanistan," is the view of Jean-Jacques Fressar, head of the International Red Cross' Kabul mission. Our colleagues in Peshawar and, I hope, we in Kabul, he said, will be given access to the Soviet guys. According to Fressar, the breakthrough was the result of efforts by Soviet diplomacy and the Soviet public and directly by the relatives of Soviet servicemen in captivity. As is known, a delegation from "Hope," the people's committee to rescue Soviet prisoners of war in Afghanistan, recently visited Islamabad and Peshawar and has now gone to Kabul. Hitherto we have been able to make only one government-authorized trip from Kabul to Vardak Province, not far from the capital, J.-J. Fressar continued. It was a joint action with our Peshawar group. Our collleagues from the base in Peshawar regularly visit the border area in Afghanistan in the provinces of Paktia, Paktika, and Konarha.

"The mujahidin showed us Afghan military and civilian captives," my interlocutor said. We inspected them and gathered the requisite information, which was subsequently handed to the Afghan Government. In the opposition camps we have so far recorded around 800 people in prison. They did not show us any Soviets. Nor have our Peshawar people been given the opportunity to meet with Soviets in the border areas controlled by the opposition, pass on their letters home, and report that they are alive...

"But it is now logical to assume," Fressar said, "that with the Kabul authorities' assistance and with the opposition's agreement we will be able to meet with Soviet people in captivity.."

According to J.-J. Fressar the difficulty of the search for undeclared prisoners of the undeclared war consists not only in the fact that one does not know the places where they might be found but also in the fact that it is a humanitarian mission in conditions of continuing military tension.

It is no secret that the prisoners of war are seen by opposition Afghan groupings' commanders as "live assets," to be bargained with. That is why the head of the International Red Cross mission in Kabul, like Mrs Sureya [name as transliterated], chairman of the Afghan Red Crescent Society, with whom we also had a meeting, avoids talking about details, relating many instances from her own very important activities. In this case glasnost before results have been achieved can only harm the cause.

"The question of bringing people back concerns not only Soviet servicemen but my compatriots as well, citizens of the Republic of Afghanistan," Sureya believes. "And it requires efforts by all sides..."

"Hope" is in Kabul. Let us hope it will succeed in taking another step toward the noble goal.

Afghan Spokesman on U.S. Supplies to Rebels

PM2507083689 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Jul 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Afghan Foreign Ministry Spokesman's Statement"]

[Text] Kabul, 19 Jul—The intention of the White House administration to increase deliveries of modern weapons to the intransigent Afghan opposition is an irresponsible step by a guarantor state of the Geneva agreements, an official spokesman for the Republic of Afghanistan Foreign Ministry declared in response to questions by the BAKHTAR agency. Afghanistan, which sincerely seeks to end the fratricide and bloodshed on its soil, has demonstrated this in practice by abiding strictly and consistently by the spirit and letter of Geneva.

However, foreign interference in Afghan affairs, including on the part of the United States and Pakistan, has not only not ended but increased significantly. The Washington administration understands perfectly well that the Afghan Armed Forces are capable of independently defending the motherland's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence, but it is stubbornly continuing deliveries of weapons to killers of totally innocent women, children, and old men, seeking not to settle but to prolong the Afghan conflict.

Now that the United States no longer has even formal pretexts for continuing its interference in Afghan affairs, arms deliveries to the opposition forces are only fueling military tension and pushing opposition members into new crimes against their own people. Such methods of "settling" the Afghan problem are arousing the Afghan people's ever-greater anger and hatred toward the war and the warmongers, the Afghan Foreign Ministry spokesman emphasized in conclusion.

USSR-Kuwaiti Cultural Agreement Signed

LD2807140589 Kuwait KUNA in English 1103 GMT 28 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, July 28 (KUNA)—Kuwait and the Soviet Union Friday signed a cultural agreement for the year 1989-90, it was announced here Friday.

The visiting secretary-general of Kuwait's National Council for Culture, Letters and Arts Dr Farouq al-Omar signed for his country, while the Soviet side was represented by Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov.

Following conclusion of [words indistinct], the two officials expressed readiness of their respective countries for further bolstering bilateral cultural ties.

The ceremony, which took place at the cultural relations department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, was attended by Kuwait's charge d'affaires to Moscow Mansur al-Awadhi, Culture Attache 'Ali al-Halibi, head of National Council's External Relations Department Mansur al-Shallahi and other Soviet foreign and culture ministries officials.

Kuwaiti Military Delegation Ends 1-Week Visit

LD2707170789 Kuwait KUNA in English 1316 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, July 27 (KUNA)—A Kuwaiti military delegation, headed by Land Forces Commander Brigadier 'Abdul 'Aziz al-Bargash, Thursday left here heading home after winding up an official week-long visit to the Soviet Union.

The Kuwaiti delegation, which conferred with First Deputy Defence Minister Konstantin Kochetov, attended war maneuvers and toured a number of army training and command centers. The visit was in response to an official invitation by the Soviet Defence Ministry. The delegation also groups Colonel Muhammad al-Harmi, Lieutenant Colonel [LC] Faud al-Haddad and LC Ahmad al-Rahmani.

Pakistan To Equip F-16 With 'Nuclear Weapons'

PM2507091789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jul 89 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Dangerous Plans"]

[Text] Bonn, 23 Jul—Pakistan is performing intensive work to prepare to equip the F-16 fighter bombers supplied by the United States with nuclear weapons of its own production. This was reported today by West German television, citing the latest issue of the weekly DER SPIEGEL, which is published on Monday.

The journal writes that the United States and Pakistan have concluded a deal for the delivery to Islamabad of 60 nuclear-capable fighter bombers. According to the journal's report, tests of F-16 models with nuclear bombs attached under their wings are being conducted in wind tunnels.

Pakistan, the news program stressed, continues to deny that work is being done in the country in the field of nuclear weapons production. The U.S. side officially adheres to the same "concept." At the same time, the television program presenter noted, within the framework of the multibillion program of military and economic aid to Islamabad, Washington has provided it with the most sophisticated nuclear-capable combat aircraft.

Sub-Saharan Africa

CPSU Delegation Arrives in Brazzaville

LD2707094689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0547 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Text] Brazzaville, 26 Jul, (TASS)—A CPSU delegation headed by V.S. Baltrunas, secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party has arrived here to take part in the 14th Congress of the Congolese Labor Party.

CPSU Greets Frelimo Congress in Mozambique

LD2707164989 Moscow TASS in English 0936 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Maputo July 27 TASS—By TASS correspondents Boris Bogdanov and Yuriy Chytov:

Head of the CPSU delegation, second secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Vitaliy Sobolev made a speech on Friday at the Frelimo Party Fifth Congress which is under way in the capital of Mozambique.

He read out the CPSU Central Committee's message of greetings to the congress.

The USSR's policy in Africa is based on the principles of renunciation of confrontation, transition to negotiations with due account for the balance of interests, the head of the delegation said. He favourably assessed the beginnings of reassuring changes that have appeared in the south of Africa in the recent months, above all the signing of the agreements on settlement in south western Africa. But there are still many obstacles on the way to peace in the region, and the main obstacle is the preservation of the apartheid regime, which is the primary cause of tension, he said.

Sobolev dwelt on the process of perestroika in the Soviet Union, the work of the Congress of Soviet People's Deputies, the CPSU's efforts to improve ethnic relations, new Soviet peace initiatives aimed at limitation and reduction of armaments.

Replying to the CPSU Central Committee's message of greetings, Joaquim Chissano, Frelimo Party chairman and president of Mozambique, expressed satisfaction with the development of the relations of friendship and cooperation between the CPSU and the Frelimo Party, the Soviet and the Mozambican peoples.

According to the credentials commission, the congress is being attended by 712 delegates who represent over 200,000 Frelimo Party members. Over 60 percent of the delegates are workers, peasants and servicemen. Delegations from 62 parties and organisations, including the CPSU, arrived for the congress.

The debate on the Frelimo Party Central Committee's report is being marked with an atmosphere of openness and constructive criticism. Speakers unanimously support the main trends in the party's foreign and home policy and meanwhile raise many acute questions.

Our forum should become a peace congress, said Armando Gestene, a delegate from the Manica Province. It should focus its attention on a search for ways of a peace settlement in the country, which will enable the solution of other problems. Adriano Pirailai, a representative of the Maputo party organisation, said that the Mozambican people pins on the congress its hopes for a new life. Many speakers stressed the need to consolidate national unity, perfect activities of party organisations and ensure social justice.

General secretary of the African National Congress of South Africa Alfred Nzo in his speech urged the world community not to relax pressure on the Pretoria regime and work for abolition of apartheid. The programme of "reforms", recently put forward by the South African ruling Nationalist Party, is nothing else but a package of outdated apartheid postulates, called upon to ensure the preservation of the white minority rule, he stressed.

Reflections on 6 Sep South African Elections

MB2707094289 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Vladimir Valentinov commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] On 24 July, nomination of the candidates to the 3-chamber South African parliament began, while general elections are due to take place on 6 September. Never before did the parliamentary elections in South Africa meet with such a powerful public resonance as this year, and this is quite understandable, for the situation on the domestic scene is largely controversial and differs greatly from that of the previous years. Here are just a few aspects.

A great upheaval is expected in South Africa. The current president of South Africa, Pieter Botha, is likely to be replaced by Frederik de Klerk, who is in the lead of the National Party now. The South African news media defines de Klerk as a flexible politician, capable of leading the nation out of a prolonged crisis as an adherent of positive changes inside the country. And de Klerk has verbally pledged to eradicate apartheid, verifying his media portrayal.

But what will happen in real life? The force of decolonization in Namibia is going on, as well as the general settlement in southwestern Africa. Now, serious apprehensions have emerged to the effect that South Africa may appear to be blocking these processes, and the participants of the current OAU summit in Addis Ababa have voiced their concern over it, though it seems to me that it is a false alarm because experts believe that South Africa stands to lose more than to gain. And that point has been underscored by the United Nations secretary general, Perez de Cuellar, who emphasized that the process of decolonization of Namibia is normally proceeding, in keeping with the schedule, though some critical problems exist. He made the statement after visiting Namibia.

A positive upheaval has made itself felt in Mozambique, and has largely been promoted by the recent visit to Mozambique by Frederik de Klerk, and the foreign minister of South Africa, Roelof Botha, and their negotiations with the Mozambican president, Joaquim Chissano.

And yet, all these positive moments in the positive situation in the region on the eve of the parliamentary elections in South Africa are not major ones. They do not determine the attitude of the black majority to the events due to take place on 6 September. The ruling circles in South Africa are still banning Africans from the voters. That is the root of opposition, and that fact largely aggravates the situation on the domestic scene, hence the United Democratic Front, the Congress of South African Trade Unions [COSATU], the National Union of Mineworkers, and other democratic organizations have called on the nation to boycott the elections.

The statement issued by the COSATU says these elections will not contribute to promoting a peaceful climate in the country. We claim that the elections are merely an attempt of the government to perpetuate apartheid while giving verbal pledges to reform. And the daily reports from South Africa prove beyond doubt that the boycott is gaining momentum.

Lithuania's Baltrunas Heads Delegation to Congo

PM2707132589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Guests of Brazzaville"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by V.S. Baltrunas, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, left for Brazzaville 24 July to participate in the Fourth Congolese Labor Party Congress.

Ambassador to Togo Appointed

PM2807090989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jul 89 Second Edition p 6

[Unattributed "News Item"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Oleg Nikolayevich Chernyy USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Republic of Togo.

East Europe

Jaruzelski-Walesa Discussion Reported

PM2707152989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "'Grand Coalition' Proposed"]

[Text] Warsaw, 26 Jul—Within the framework of consultations aimed at forming a government, Polish President W. Jaruzelski received L. Walesa, chairman of the "Solidarity" Citizens' Committee.

W. Jaruzelski presented a proposal to create a "grand coalition" government, assuming broad participation in it by opposition representatives, including the position of first deputy head of government.

L. Walesa proposed an alternative way to form a government: either completely from the opposition, or a coalition. In his view, persons associated with the opposition could join the coalition government.

Poland's president also received A. Miodowicz, chairman of the National Trade Union Alliance; Z. Komender, chairman of the Lay Catholics' Society (PAX) Board; J. Maksymiuk, chairman of the National Union of Farmers and Agricultural Circles and Organizations Main Council Presidium; and J. Slisz, chairman of the individual farmers' "Solidarity."

Yazov's Anniversary Message to Poland's Siwicki

PM2707133789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Jul 89 First Edition p 1

[Army General D. Yazov message: "To Army General Comrade Florian Siwicki, Polish Minister of National Defense"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Minister!

On behalf of the Soviet Armed Forces and on my own behalf I cordially congratulate you and Polish Army servicemen on your national holiday—the 45th anniversary of Poland's rebirth.

The revolutionary processes of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and the socialist renewal and reforms in Poland are opening up new prospects for our countries and peoples of fruitful collaboration—not least in international affairs—based on equal rights, mutual respect, and allied solidarity. Sovereign and independent Poland is an important factor in ensuring stability and security in Europe. Soviet servicemen note with satisfaction that the fraternal friendship and comprehensive cooperation between the USSR Armed Forces and the Polish Army and the armies of the other Warsaw Pact states are invariably strengthening and deepening in the interests of peace and socialism.

On this holiday I wish you, Comrade Minister, and Polish Army personnel, success in ensuring the reliable defense of Polish working people's socialist gains and in carrying out the responsible tasks facing the Polish People's Army.
Army General D. Yazov, USSR defense minister

Yakovlev's Meeting With MSZMP's Ivanyi Noted

PM2707135989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Talks at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] On 25 July A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with P. Ivanyi, member of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] Political Executive Committee and secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee.

Some questions of Soviet-Hungarian cooperation, an exchange of experience of socialist transformations, and the further development of CPSU-MSZMP contacts were examined in the talks.

V.I. Stukalin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR ambassador to Hungary, participated in the meeting.

Hungarian-Soviet Talks 'Important Milestone'

LD2507125189 Moscow International Service in Hungarian 1630 GMT 24 Jul 89

[Text] The working visit to Moscow by Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] leaders Karoy Grosz is attracting great interest in Soviet public opinion. Yuriy Rogov, our special correspondent, is in front of our microphone to comment on the visit which starts today.

[Rogov] I would like to start by saying that I sat down in front of the microphone with a special feeling because we are talking about an event that will undoubtedly be an important milestone along the road toward the expansion and renewal of Soviet-Hungarian cooperation. The visit of the Hungarian leaders comes at a time when under the leadership of the CPSU and the MSZMP perestroyka is underway in both countries; the reforms are materialized. Of course, we cannot talk very much about the concrete agenda of the forthcoming negotiations, although we may have certain assumptions taking as a point of departure the recent meeting in Bucharest between Rezso Nyeres and Mikhail Gorbachev.

At the same time it must also be taken into account that in the Soviet Union the MSZMP's attempts to consolidate internal party unity and strengthen the unity of the working people of Hungary are welcomed. As was singled out in the course of the talks, we resolutely eliminate attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of the partners from the practice of our relations. In our activity our point of departure must primarily be the interests of our own countries and peoples. At the same time there is no need to forget the fact that the successes of our countries do, in the final analysis, represent and serve the interests of the entire community.

I would like to recall a thought from the work of comrade Nyers published recently in Budapest. The MSZMP chairman writes that he does not see the development of the socialist countries as a march of military units but as a movement of groups of tourists—in which every member of the tourist group has the possibility to stop, look around, and have a think. We are members of the same community and the final aim, the building of a new society, is the same.

These thoughts occurred to me in advance of the forthcoming meetings and negotiations in Moscow. Every country has the right to elect—and it does so, too—the roads which are optimum for it, which lead toward the designated objective. However, it is easier to advance if one senses at one's side one's reliable friend, and the meetings in Moscow promote the maintenance and consolidation of a spirit of mutual confidence and understanding. In such a situation it is easier to solve all the issues raised concerning political, cultural, and economic cooperation.

At the threshold of the visit Gyula Thurmer, foreign policy adviser of the MSZMP general secretary, announced that in his view the Moscow negotiations might contain various new elements as well. All this spurs us to await with special interest the results of the Moscow meetings.

Outcome of Hungarian By-Elections Assessed

PM2707144389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent F. Lukyanov: "Second Round Will Sort Out the Issue"]

[Text] Budapest—The attention of the whole of Hungary and even foreign countries has been captured by the National Assembly elections held in four constituencies. The point is that for the first time in 40 years each seat was contested not simply by several candidates but by candidates belonging to different parties and sociopolitical organizations of diverse political persuasion.

In other words, representatives of the ruling party and the opposition squared up to each other for the first time in an open contest for the electorate's votes. For the opposition, which is insisting on the dissolution of the present parliament and the holding of an early general election, a convincing victory would provide a strong argument. It is not surprising therefore that it ran a very energetic election campaign in all four cities. It was started when deputies were recalled in three constituencies as a result of a collection of voters' signatures carried out by the opposition. In the city of Kiskunfelegyhaza, for example, Mihaly Korom, who is considered a "hardliner," was unseated.

I would remind you that a public opinion poll held 1 month ago showed that, if a general election were held now, the majority of the electorate would vote for the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP], although a number of opposition parties such as the Hungarian Democratic Forum and the Hungarian Social Democratic Party would also receive quite a few votes. The test of strength in the four constituencies could modify the poll results.

So what did the elections show, then? In three of the four constituencies no single candidate gained sufficient votes. In Kiskunfelegyhaza MSZMP member Istvan Garay [name as transliterated] won 44.9 percent of the votes and outstripped his rivals from the opposition, but this did not prove enough. On the other hand, in Szeged and Kecskemet the candidates of the Hungarian Democratic Forum were ahead of their rivals but likewise failed to become deputies. Only in one constituency, that of Godollo, located near Budapest, did 10,897 votes for out of 15,608 cast determine the seat in favor of the single opposition candidate, Gabor Roszik, a member of the Hungarian Democratic Front and a priest in the Evangelical Church. This first opposition member of parliament is 35 years old and has four children.

It would certainly be premature to draw far-reaching conclusions or forecast the outcome of a general election in Hungary solely on the basis of elections held in four constituencies. But it would also be rash to disregard the results.

Seeking to explain the possible reasons for the failure of the MSZMP candidate in Godollo, D. Khertsenik [name as transliterated], secretary of the local city party committee, acknowledged that mistakes had been made there, for which the ruling party's candidate had clearly paid the price.

It is also obvious that the opposition did not gain the advantage that it was counting on. Its first mass attack had misfired.. Many voters (more than half in Szeged) simply did not vote. BBC radio regarded this as a serious blow to the opposition.

The second round of voting on 5 August will clearly sort out the issue.

SFRY Presidency Composition Now Complete

PM2607133589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Ye. Vostrukhov dispatch under the "IZVESTIYA Correspondents Comment" rubric: "All Vacancies Filled"]

[Text] Belgrade—A kind of crisis in the membership of the SFRY Presidency has lasted for more than 2 months.

This is the first time that the country's supreme state organ has worked at less than full strength for such a protracted period. It has already been announced that 15 May only six full members of the Federal Assembly Presidency had been ratified instead of eight.

The legitimate representatives of two republics—Macedonia and Bosnia-Hercegovina—were absent. During elections of these republics' representatives to the SFRY Presidency the voters unanimously "rejected" candidates lacking in prestige who were nominated behind their backs by bureaucratic "upper echelons." The presidents of these republics' presidencies occupied the absentees' posts in the interim, and only with the right to a consultative vote. Nevertheless by and large the Yugoslav public assessed this unprecedented fact with satisfaction.

According to the press, the preparations for elections to the SFRY Presidency clearly reflected the incipient positive processes of democratization within the country and the increase in self-awareness and public activeness among working people in the course of the developing reform of the political system.

Early this year elections of presidency members were held everywhere with unheard-of enthusiasm. For the first time they were elected by secret direct ballot, and obligatorily from among several candidates. Attempts to conduct a responsible political campaign in the old way, "as usual," failed. Candidacies put forward in head offices did not come off this time. "Previously," Sarajevo's OSLOBODJENJE wrote, "we all took part in the notorious 'one-horse races,' where the elections were in effect over at the very beginning: You only had to name a candidate for him to consider himself automatically elected"...

The first lessons of the elections were carefully analyzed. They were discussed not only by public organizations but also by all working people. Delegates from the Bosnia-Hercegovina Federal Assembly have just voted unanimously in favor of a new member of the SFRY Presidency from their republic. He is Bogic Bogicevic. But the results of this vote were determined previously—at the end of last month—by the people at general elections. Five candidacies were put on the secret ballot paper then. The youngest candidate—B. Bogicevic, a member of the Bosnia-Hercegovina League of Communists Central Committee Presidium—unexpectedly won a convincing victory in the first round, in which 1,906 voters took part. After his candidacy was confirmed at the Federal Assembly he became the youngest member of the SFRY Presidency—he is 35 years old.

"Lastly, the elections were notable for people's uplifted sentiments," L. Ninkovic, secretary of the Socialist Alliance of Working People of Yugoslavia republic conference presidium, said. "In conditions of an extremely grave economic and sociopolitical crisis we are delighted by the results of these elections. The party is continuing to enjoy prestige under difficult crisis conditions. The voters voted for a Communist."

The Macedonian vacancy in the Presidency has also been filled finally. In nationwide elections Communist Vasil Tupurkovski won 76.5 percent of the vote, almost four times more votes than his next rival. He also represents a new generation in the country's collective leadership.

Incidentally, Yugoslav newspapers have noted with satisfaction that the incumbent Presidency is the youngest in the history of the SFRY. For President J. Drnovsek is only 39 years old. And it is very important that the views of the majority of the members of the Presidency, irrespective of age, on the need to extricate the country from the crisis as quickly as possible and affirm its prestige in the international arena fully coincide.

I will note the following in conclusion: Contrary to expectations, such a protracted absence of plenipotentiary representatives from two republics in the country's state headquarters has not brought about any complications. No acute situations or disagreements have arisen.

CPCZ Secretariat Discusses Political Training

PM2707143189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent S. Vtorushin dispatch under the rubric "The Life of Fraternal Parties": "Words as Weapons"]

[Text] Prague, 25 July—Political education, one of the basic forms of party ideological work, has a long tradition in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ]. It helps to master the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism and the dialectical methods of thinking and provides communists with arguments and facts. Unfortunately, a number of stereotypes have become ingrained in party training in the last few years, reducing its effectiveness. This was noted at the sitting of the CPCZ Central Committee Secretariat which discussed questions of political education in the period of preparation for the 18th party congress.

At the sitting it was said that raising the intellectual level of party training would make it possible to get rid of unoriginal thought, passivity, indifference, and all kinds of doubts and hesitations among certain members of the CPCZ.

The political education system has a specific feature: Its audience is, as a rule, made up of communists with a great deal of life and political experience. And if the process of training is built on comradely dialogue, this will help many social problems to be understood more precisely, a unified view to be worked out, and ideological unity to be strengthened. At the same time the effectiveness of training depends to a great extent on the qualifications of the teacher. That is why a certification of all the lecturers in CPCZ kraj, city and district committees is carried out.

Today the masses need more than anything timely and truthful reasoning based on party principles. This is the most effective weapon against those who try to discredit the process of perestroyka and the whole course of socialist building, it was stressed at the sitting.

CPCZ Claim of Western 'Subversion' Cited

PM2707143989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Thorn in the Side"]

[Text] The increased activity by illegal antisocialist structures in Czechoslovakia is an inalienable component of the struggle being conducted against the CSSR and socialism by foreign antisocialist centers.

This idea is expressed by the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee weekly TRIBUNA in an article on the activities of so-called "illegal structures" in the CSSR.

There have been calls in the West to announce a new "Marshall Plan" for those socialist countries which are "democratizing their societies" and "respect human rights." Thus, TRIBUNA writes, a differentiated approach to individual socialist countries is a typical feature of the West's ideological and political influence.

The CSSR stands in the way of the creation of a bloc of "reformist" countries which, bourgeois politicians and analysts are proposing, would move toward the gradual elimination of socialist leaderships. The fact that we will not allow the republic to be subverted, nor reassess the critical events of 1968-1969, nor legalize the activity of antisocialist structures—whose program is to try to restore a bourgeois democratic system in Czechoslovakia under the slogan of "defense of human rights and democracy"—is a thorn in the side of the West's anticommunist centers, the weekly continues.

Czechoslovak Leaders Vacationing in USSR

PM2707153189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Vacation in the USSR"]

[Text] M. Jakes, general secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPCZ) Central Committee, and L. Adamec, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and chairman of the CSSR government, arrived in the USSR on 25 July for a vacation at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

West Europe

Further Reportage on Yazov, Biryukova UK Visit

Yazov-Younger News Conference

PM2807102589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jul 89 First Edition p 1

[Special correspondent Colonel V. Markushin dispatch: "Stay in Britain"]

[Excerpts] The official visit to Britain by a Soviet military delegation headed by Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, began 25 July with a colorful welcome ceremony in front of Britain's Ministry of Defense Building, where the Royal Lifeguards formed an honor guard.

A meeting was held at midday at 10 Downing Street in the British prime minister's residence between Army General D.T. Yazov and Margaret Thatcher. [passage omitted]

A little later the USSR defense minister had a conversation with G. Younger and Britain's newly-appointed defense secretary T. King at the government residence Lancaster House, which is used for various official ceremonies.

A joint press conference given by USSR Defense Minister Army General D.T. Yazov and G. Younger was also held here. In a brief opening speech G. Younger said that the Soviet minister's visit may be regarded as heralding broader contacts between British and Soviet servicemen. The meeting between the two countries' defense ministers is timely and promotes an increase in mutual trust.

In his speech USSR Defense Minister Army General D.T. Yazov stressed, in particular, that the very fact of the incipient dialogue between Soviet and British military personnel after the long "cold war" years attests to substantial progress in Soviet-British relations and both countries' increasing interest in one another. The meeting with Prime Minister Thatcher was also significant in this respect.

The "cold war" years are behind us, Army General D.T. Yazov went on to say. This has happened because the peoples manifested goodwill and the first breakthrough has been made in nuclear arms reductions. I would like to point out that the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles is in operation. It is being implemented strictly within the prescribed framework. Neither the USSR nor the United States has any mutual complaints here.

Talks on conventional and strategic offensive arms are now under way simultaneously. Not everything is going smoothly, there are questions that require amplification and study. However, accords are possible in principle.

The Soviet Union has agreed to a unilateral reduction in its Armed Forces of 500,000 men and has proclaimed the defensive nature of its military doctrine. Not everyone has realized what is behind this and have asked us: Your doctrine is defensive but your troop groupings and structures are offensive. We have replied: Not everything can be changed straightaway. Today we have already withdrawn three tank divisions from the territory of allied states. Next year we will withdraw another three. In the light of the structural changes in the remaining divisions we will have 10,000, 8,500, and 820 fewer tanks, guns, and aircraft respectively. These are impressive efforts. Moreover, we are unilaterally withdrawing from our allied states 500 units of nuclear munitions. That is, our words and deeds are not at variance with one another.

Military men have said at all times that the more weapons the better in order to arm oneself. Now you have before you a USSR defense minister who is talking about disarmament. A paradox? No, that is the situation, D.T. Yazov said in conclusion.

Questions were then answered, mainly concerning clarification of the Soviet side's standpoints on chemical weapons, naval forces, assessment of the prospects for achieving accords at the NATO-Warsaw Pact talks, and also bilateral Soviet-British contacts.

Speaking about the prospects for Soviet-British military contacts, D.T. Yazov and G. Younger said that the sides have exchanged the appropriate proposals. These proposals will be studied in order to adopt subsequent decisions, possibly at the level of chiefs of general staff.

Yazov Meets Foreign Secretary Mayor

LD2807075389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1850 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] London, 27 Jul (TASS)—Army General D.T. Yazov, USSR minister of defence, today had a conversation with John Major, the new British foreign secretary. During the course of it certain questions of mutual interest were touched upon.

The same day D.T. Yazov gave a dinner at the Soviet Embassy in honor of Tom King, the new British defense secretary, and George Younger, his predecessor in this post. Other heads of the British military department and members of the Soviet delegation were present at dinner.

Yazov Visits Military Centers

LD2707220189 Moscow TASS in English 2130 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] London July 28 TASS—Army General Dmitriy Yazov, alternate member of the Politbureau of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and Soviet defence minister who is staying on an official visit in Britain, as well as other members of the Soviet delegation saw British military schools on Thursday.

In the morning of July 27 the delegation arrived in the training centre of an airborne brigade in Aldershot. They were welcomed by General Sir Charles Huxtable, commander of the Ground Forces on British territory, and Lieutenant General Sir Peter de la Billiere, commander of the South-Eastern Military district. The Soviet delegation had a conversation with commanders of the centre. The Soviet guests saw a training complex of the airborne regiment, its layout, and attended classes.

Then the delegation went to the British Military School of Ground Forces in Sandhurst. The Soviet defence minister was welcomed by Major General Peter Graham, head of the school, and Dr Dennis Liver, director of the teaching department. The Soviet delegation saw the school, specifically, its computer centre and training complex.

Biryukova Tours Enterprises

PM2707152389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Visit Continues"]

[Text] Nottingham (Nottinghamshire), 26 Jul—The Soviet delegation headed by A.P. Biryukova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, which is on a visit to Britain, visited here an enterprise belonging to the firm Boots, one of the largest producers of medicines, cosmetics, toiletries, and other output.

While in the cities of Oldham and Halifax the delegation toured the "Maple Mill" enterprise belonging to the firm Courtaulds and the Crossroll Company's plant for the production of textile equipment.

In the course of conversations the Soviet and British sides noted the mutual need for more active development of modern forms of economic cooperation, primarily the creation of joint enterprises and the expansion of production sharing. There was discussion of several specific questions in this context.

According to David Clark, a spokesman for Courtaulds, much experience of partnership relations between Soviet and British enterprises has been accumulated in the light industry sphere. But our cooperation does not stop there. Thanks to the liberalization of foreign economic activity in the USSR, we have been given an opportunity to jointly promote new ideas and to discuss progressive avenues in the development of light industry. Courtaulds is interested in establishing long-term fruitful economic relations with the Soviet side, and opportunities for this do exist, he emphasized.

Adamishin, UK Official Discuss African Conflicts

PM2607102989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jul 89 Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 17 July, A.L. Adamishin, USSR deputy foreign minister, gave a luncheon in honor of P. Fairweather, UK assistant under secretary at the Foreign Office, who is in Moscow for consultations on African problems.

The consultations, held in constructive and businesslike spirit, examined among other things questions relating to the political settlement of conflict situations in various regions of the African continent.

Soviet Envoy To Mediate on Bulgaria-Turkey Issue

TA2107192689 Ankara ANATOLIA in Turkish 1555 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Text] Ankara, 21 Jul (AA)—Soviet Ambassador to Ankara Albert Chernyshev left for Moscow today to conduct a new round of contacts within the initiative launched by the Soviet Union on the Bulgarian issue.

In a statement to our correspondent at Ankara's Esenboga Airport, Chernyshev said that he is going to Moscow for consultations and that he will return to Turkey on 24 July.

Pointing out that the Soviet Union is ready to continue its goodwill initiatives on the Bulgarian issue as long as both sides want, Chernyshev expressed the belief that dialogue is the only way to resolve the problems between Turkey and Bulgaria.

The Soviet ambassador said: There will be a dialogue sooner or later. I believe this. Not only I, the Soviet Union also believes it. I am still optimistic.

Chernyshev added that after Moscow he will proceed to Sofia, where he will hold contacts.

Allegations on Turkish Weapon Supplies Refuted

TA2307155489 Ankara ANATOLIA in Turkish 1535 GMT 23 Jul 89

[Text] Ankara, 23 Jul (AA)—Ambassador Inal Batu, Foreign Ministry spokesman, has described Georgian allegations that the Abkhazians have been receiving weapons from Turkey as "totally absurd."

Following allegations leveled by certain Georgians on German television that the Abkhazians have been receiving weapons from Turkey, Batu replied to a question on the subject by an ANATOLIA correspondent. Batu rejected these allegations.

The Georgians charged that the Abkhazians, who are arming themselves in Sukhumi, committed massacres with the aim of triggering a civil war. They also claimed that Moscow is supporting the Abkhazians and has turned a blind eye to the weapons brought into the area from Turkey.

Turkish Coverage of Nagorno-Karabakh Criticized

PM2807080389 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 8 Jul 89 p 4

[Article by A. Kirakosyan, R. Safrastyan, and L. Eyramdzhyan: "Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast: In the Turkish Propaganda Mirror"]

[Excerpts] The problem of Nagorno-Karabakh elicits a broad response in the pages of the world press. In this the Turkish mass media devote special attention to coverage of events around the problem of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. There is nothing surprising in this. Turkey directly borders on this region of the USSR and is one of NATO's most active members, and any problems in our country, not to mention the events in Azerbaijan and Armenia, do, of course, arouse heightened interest there. In addition, the history of Soviet-Turkish relations attests to our southern neighbor's far from indifferent attitude toward the territory of the Transcausian region. [passage omitted]

Turkish television, which covers the Karabakh events in daily newscasts and the monthly information program "32d Day," mainly endeavors to create the semblance of a desire to avoid political assessments. Radio and television prefer short sketches about Nagorno-Karabakh and reportages on the thousands-strong demonstrations in Yerevan's Theater Square, although they do not miss an opportunity, as if by chance, to shift emphases, to keep quiet about something very important, or to pass off an uncharacteristic detail as something special. Thus, during 8-14 May this year Turkish television, addressing the events in the NKAO, reported that clashes had taken place there between Armenians and Azerbaijanis. Quite right, you might think. Clashes really did take place. But it went on to report that those clashes began with Armenians attacking Azerbaijanis in a certain village (?), injuring seven people. Of course, the television did not say precisely which village, because the tragic events in the village of Khodzhaly, obviously the ones in question, were based on facts of the opposite kind, and the victims there were mainly inhabitants of Armenian nationality. In conclusion, the television reported that there were tanks in the oblast center. Precisely—tanks. But, it turned out, not in Stepanakert but in the city of Khankendy (?!), modified in the Turkish manner.

A broadcast by Turkish radio's information service destined for the population of Azerbaijan reported quite without commentary that the majority of the victims of the tragic events in February 1988 manifestly declare that [here there is an apparent line drop] nationality. The program "32d Day," broadcast 5 December 1988, is also

characteristic in this respect. The program's filming group had visited Moscow, Baku, and Sumgait in November. In addition to objective information, it contained a number of insinuations not in keeping with reality. It claimed, for example, that Armenians control the Western press, which, for this reason, covers the Karabakh events from their viewpoint.

The authors of some newspaper articles try to give their own interpretation of the Nagorno-Karabakh problem but, at the same time, they display a total "lack of understanding" of the real causes and nature of the events. Turkish newspaper materials are frequently of a manifestly tendentious and inflammatory nature. The matter reaches the point where the Turkish mass media try specially to distort reality, present the reader with materials of a deliberately provocative nature, and seek to shift all the blame for the events taking place in the NKAO and in Azerbaijan onto Armenians, Armenian organizations abroad, and the church, trying here to back this lampoon up with absurd theoretical computations. For example, Ali Mehmet Birand, a leading Turkish journalist, maintains in the newspaper MILLIYET that relations between Armenians and Azerbaijanis began to deteriorate chiefly in the mid-seventies in parallel with the intensification of the anti-Turkish campaign in connection with the claims of "so-called genocide against Armenians." Professor Khasan Keni [name as transliterated] and the well-known commentator Sami Kohen cynically declare in the same newspaper that Armenians, inspired by the European Parliament's adoption in 1987 of the resolution "On a Political Solution to the Armenian Question," took advantage of the new Soviet leadership's policy of glasnost and decided, with the support of the church, foreign parties, and extremist and terrorist organizations, to raise the question of Nagorno-Karabakh's joining Armenia. Birand writes in this connection: "Many conservative circles in the West openly foment phenomena of this kind in the (union) republics. An example of this is provided by the recent events, in fomenting which the Armenian church plays a special role." Either not understanding or maliciously concealing the essence of the problem and blaming the events in Nagorno-Karabakh on the "hand of the West," the Turkish journalist goes still further, seeking to equate Western conservative circles and the Armenian church and to portray the latter as doing the will of these circles.

There are also provocations of a different kind. MILLIYET carried in its 7 March issue a report by the Turkish ANA agency on a conversation which supposedly took place in Moscow with an Azerbaijani named Ali. We will cite an excerpt from the text: "They (Moscow) will not dare to hand over Karabakh to the Armenians, because they know that war will start... We are sure that our brothers in Turkey and Iran will help us... Armenians began the incidents in Kirovabad, Sumgait, and Baku. They started burning houses and killing children... If the Armenians do not want to live with us on our land as brothers, let them go. We will not give up our land to them. Armenians and their 'Dashnaktsutyun' party instigated the events which had a tragic outcome. Trucks bring cabbages into Karabakh, beneath which weapons and ammunition are hidden, sent by 'Dashnaktsutyun.'" [passage omitted]

Having analyzed the Turkish mass media's materials on the Nagorno-Karabakh problem, it is possible to arrive at the following conclusion. The Turkish mass news organs' coverage of the Nagorno-Karabakh problem is part of Turkey's traditional campaign of interfering in the Soviet Union's internal affairs, setting the peoples of a multinational country against each other, and falsifying the Armenian people's historical past, including denying the 1915 genocide. You might think that nowadays, when there is an ever-increasing trend in the world toward improving the general political situation and strengthening trust between peoples and states, the Turkish mass media could have displayed the maximum restraint in their coverage of such a complex and delicate issue as the Nagorno-Karabakh problem, which falls entirely within the competence of the Soviet Union, and endeavored not to be in a position to be accused of interfering in the internal affairs of a neighboring state.

Reportage on French Senate Delegation's Visit

Dobrynin Receives Delegation

LD2607202389 Moscow TASS in English 1243 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 26 TASS—A delegation of the foreign affairs, defence and armed forces' commission of the French Senate, now staying in the USSR on a visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet's international affairs and defence and state security committees, met here on Tuesday with Anatoliy Dobrynin, adviser of the Soviet president.

Some aspects of the foreign policy of the USSR and France, contemporary approaches to military-political problems of the European Continent, and prospects of improvement of the world situation on the principles of new political thinking were considered.

Soviet of Union Chairman Meets Group

LD2607105989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2000 GMT 25 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 25 Jul (TASS)—Completing the program of meetings scheduled during its visit, the French Senate's Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Armed Forces Commission delegation today visited the USSR Supreme Soviet's Council of the Union. Yevgeniy Primakov, the chairman of this chamber, told the visitors about several aspects of the work of the Soviet parliament in the new conditions.

"I want to point to the great fruitfulness of the visit for us," said Jean Lecanuet, president of the Senate's commission, who heads the delegation. "As a result of the meetings, conversations, and visits that have taken

place," he continued, "we have been enriched by extremely concrete information about perestroyka, and we now understand it better. We all wish success to Soviet perestroyka, and after returning to France we will support it with even greater vigor."

Delegation Departs Moscow

LD2607202589 Moscow TASS in English 1538 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 26 TASS—A delegation of the French Seante commission on external affairs, defence and armed forces, led by its chairman Jean Lecanuet, left Moscow for Paris today.

The delegation stayed in the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet parliament's committees on international affairs and defence and state security.

Cypriots Mark 1974 Coup, Invasion Anniversary

PM2507132389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

[Own correspondent V. Potapov dispatch: "Anniversary of a Tragedy"]

[Text] Athens, 21 Jul—Cypriots have marked the 15th anniversary of the occupation of the northern part of the island with a massive rally in the capital's Victory Square.

In his speech President of the Republic Y. Vasiliou noted that a twofold crime had been committed against the Cypriot people—the antigovernment coup of 1974, and the invasion of the island by Turkish troops. Cypriots, he emphasized, will never agree to the division of the island, nor the presence there of Turkish armed forces and settlers, nor the violation of human rights.

The 15th anniversary of the Cypriot people's tragedy has been accompanied by a flareup of tension on the island. On the eve of the anniversary, women staging a peaceful demonstration in support of the right to return to their homes crossed the demarcation line in the northern part of Nicosia in a symbolic march. In the neutral zone armed Turkish Cypriot formations pounced on them, arresting more than 100 people. The leadership of the republic is following the development of events with alarm. The Cypriot Government has lodged a protest in connection with the "unlawful actions of the Turkish Cypriot side in the neutral zone." President Y. Vasiliou has accused the Turkish Cypriot side of "creating a tragic and unacceptable situation" and declared that the government of the republic intends "to keep a cool head and act with a sense of responsibility."

Karpov Receives Italian, Egyptian Envoys

PM2507113389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 19 July V.P. Karpov, USSR deputy foreign minister, received F. Salleo, Italian ambassador to the Soviet Union.

On the same day V.P. Karpov received A.M. al-Sayyid, Egyptian ambassador to Moscow, at the latter's request, to talk about some disarmament issues.

Kovalev Receives Italian Ambassador 13 Jul

PM2507140789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jul 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A.G. Kovalev, first deputy foreign minister, received F. Salleo, Italian ambassador to the USSR, 13 July. During the talk the state of and prospects for the development of Soviet-Italian relations in various spheres, including political dialogue, were discussed, as were certain substantive international problems.

Petrovskiy Receives Greek Ambassador 19 Jul

PM2507113189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 19 July V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, received I. Gounaris, Greek ambassador to the Soviet Union, at the latter's request.

Gorbachev Sends Greetings to Luxembourg Ruler

LD2507131489 Moscow TASS in English 1110 GMT 25 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 25 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has sent Jean, the Grand Duke of Luxembourg, a congratulatory message on the occasion of the national holiday of Luxembourg.

The message expresses wishes of success and well-being and stresses that the Soviet Union highly assesses the friendly and mutually beneficial cooperation with Luxembourg a weighty contribution to which was the Soviet prime minister's visit to Luxembourg this year.

In his reply message the Grand Duke of Luxembourg expressed gratitude for the congratulations and wished success and prosperity to the Soviet people with whom Luxembourg is linked with the ties of friendship and cooperation.

Latin America & Caribbean

Moscow Meeting Marks Cuban Anniversary

PM2707141989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Cuban People's Festival"]

[Text] The successes achieved by Cuba's working people under the Communist Party's leadership in various spheres of the economy, science, and culture have radically changed the country's appearance. Cuba's prestige in the international arena is growing daily, as it makes a weighty contribution to resolving hotbeds of tension, strengthening world security, and asserting the new political thinking in international affairs. This was pointed out 25 July at a ceremonial meeting of representatives of the Moscow public devoted to the 36th anniversary of the national uprising.

The speakers emphasized that the storming of the Moncada Barracks was a historic landmark in the Cuban people's long struggle for their liberation and opened up the way to the revolution's victory and the country's advance toward socialism. Soviet-Cuban relations are now linked by close bonds of friendship. The Soviet-Cuban summit in Havana in April and the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the USSR and Cuba which was signed there were of great significance for their further development.

R.F. Mirabal Fernandez, charge d'affaires ad interim of the Republic of Cuba in the USSR, addressed the gathering. He spoke about the main stages in the Cuban people's struggle for their freedom and independence.

Participating in the meeting were N.P. Laverov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations; and also a delegation of the Cuban Institute of Friendship of the Peoples and the Cuban-Soviet Friendship Association headed by J. Aizpurua, the association's vice president.

Yazov Greets Raul Castro on Cuban Jubilee

PM2807133589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jul 89 First Edition p 1

[USSR Defense Minister D. Yazov message to Cuban Revolutionary Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro]

[Text] To Comrade Army General Raul Castro Ruz, minister of the Cuban Revolutiuonary Armed Forces.

Esteemed comrade minister,
On behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and on my own account I cordially congratulate you and all the troops of the Revolutionary Armed Forces on National Uprising Day.

The exploit of the heroes of the storming of the Moncada Barracks was a symbol of the Cuban people's courage and steadfastness and heralded the victorious nationwide revolution in January 1959.

On the fraternal Cuban people's national holiday I wish you, Comrade Minister, and the entire personnel of the revolutionary armed forces future successes in building socialism and in strengthening the defense capability of the Republic of Cuba.

May the indestructible friendship and comprehensive cooperation of our peoples and armies grow stronger and develop!
Army General D. Yazov, USSR minister of defense.

Cuban Charge Speaks on 'National Uprising Day'

LD2707132189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today the Cuban people are marking their national holiday, national uprising day. Taking part in our program is Rafael Mirabal, charge d'affairs of the Republic of Cuba in the Soviet Union.

[Mirabal] Dear Soviet television viewers, 36 years ago, on 26 July, 1953, the Cuban people began the struggle to win genuine and ultimate independence, the culmination of which was the nationwide victory of January 1, 1959. Right from the very begining, our people met with such resistance on the part of the all-powerful northern neighbor which demonstrated yet again that its notorious loyalty to the principles of freedom, democracy, and respect for the rights of people is no more than a universal mask behind which it tries to hide its strivings for hegemony. In violation of all international norms and rights, the opening of a television station is planned, directed against our country. A provocative act like that with unpredictable consequences for peace on the planet will receive a decisive and worthy response from our people.

Today when many people are hastening to predict the collapse of socialism, presenting it as a bygone, unsuccessful model, our experience of these years with [words indistinct] victories and failures confirms that only socialism is capable of resolving the urgent tasks which mankind is confronting at the present time. Mistakes were not avoided, and therefore at the given stage the process of ratification is going ahead under the leadership of the party and Comrade Fidel Castro in our country. Our people are enthusiasts, fighters and internationalists and from day to day are forging the leading ties of friendship and cooperation between our countries. In giving Comrade Gorbachev a warm welcome during his visit to Cuba, the Cuban people demonstrated once again the tremendous respect for the Soviet people and expresses wishes for success in resolving the complicated tasks confronting them.

Big new opportunities are opening up for the development of multilateral cooperation between Cuba and the USSR in

such new spheres as electronics, the production of medical equipment, and biotechnology, which was demonstrated when assistance was offered to the victims of the earthquake in Armenia and the disaster in Chelyabinsk.

Dear comrades, on this important day, we assure you that the island that you have called the island of freedom will always be worthy to bear this honorable name. Thank you for your attention.

Political & Social

Supreme Soviet Discusses Baltic Issues 27 Jul

Lukyanov on Financial Autonomy

LD2707201289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Remarks by Anatoliy Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of USSR Supreme Soviet, from recorded relay of 27 July Supreme Soviet morning session in the Kremlin]

[Excerpts] Good morning, comrade deputies. By 1000, 383 deputies had registered—192 deputies from the Soviet of the Union and 191 from the Soviet of Nationalities. But evidently several more deputies will be arriving. So we are competent to open the session; I declare the session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities open.

First we need to consider the issues, finish considering the issues which were being considered by us yesterday and adopt decisions on these issues. The drafts of these decisions have been distributed to all deputies. Yesterday representatives of the chambers spent a long time conducting consultations, both with the representatives of our committees and commissions, and with representatives of the Baltic States. Two agreed drafts are being submitted for your consideration. The first draft is on the proposals of the Supreme Soviets of the Lithuanian and Estonian Soviet Socialist Republics [SSR's] on the transition of these republics to financial autonomy. You have these drafts in your hands; if I may, I will now read them out.

So this morning again, in accordance with a request from the Latvian delegation, which as we have seen has also tabled its own draft law on economic independence in Latvia, in the first draft on the transition of these republics to financial autonomy from 1 January, a draft consisting of three points—you see it in your hands—is is proposed in the heading and in the first point to add the words: on the Latvian SSR. Then this decision would sound like this: A decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the proposals of the Supreme Soviets of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian SSR's on the transition of these republics to financial autonomy. The USSR Supreme Soviet decides: First, to approve the proposals of the Supreme Soviets of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian SSR's on the transition of the aforementioned republics to financial autonomy from 1 January 1990. Second, to charge the Council of Ministers, jointly with the Councils of Ministers of the Lithuanian and Estonian SSR, to conduct—[Lukyanov corrects himself]—Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian SSR's to conduct preparatory work on the transition of these republics to financial autonomy. Third, to establish that the legislative acts of the Union SSR regulating economic relations operate on the territories of the aforementioned republics insofar as they do not hinder the transition of financial autonomy. The texts are agreed. I think that the first decision may be put to the vote. Are there any objections? No one has any objections? Have the comrades from the Baltics? No? It is put to the vote. [passage omitted]

[Lukyanov] Thank you, I have understood your question. What is being said is that the two documents have different names. The point is that we passed and agreed on this yesterday with the republics—about financial autonomy—on the transition. You understand that the concept of economic independence is significantly wider. These are issues of ownership and many other issues and social issues. For this reason the second decision has the same name as the second decision which you have on the proposals of the Supreme Soviets of only two republics, because only two republics have tabled them with us—the commissions have discussed only two republics. This transition, as the laws are called there, is about the transition to economic independence. It is these laws which will be worked on further during the second reading. I think that the deputies understand this difference. For this reason there are different names, of course. For this reason, if there are no observations, I will put the first draft law to the vote. Let's vote. There is so much commotion here you could end up giving any draft the wrong name. If you please, comrade Yudin. [passage omitted]

[Lukyanov] I think that this question should be addressed to the governments and the Supreme Soviets of other republics which have spoken here and which should consider all of this. This is a very major issue.

[Unidentified deputy] Anatoliy Ivanovich, I think that during the second reading—this is the first (?round) of the first reading—during the second reading the volume of production for each republic must be prepared...

[Lukyanov, interrupting] Let us resolve the first issue, the first issue. Thank you. I put to the vote the draft decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the proposals of the Supreme Soviets of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian SSR's on the transition of these republics to financial autonomy. I ask those who are in favor of this decision to raise their identity cards. Thank you. I ask you to lower them. Who is against? Against, I ask to see.

Fifteen against. Who abstained, please? Vote, please. Who abstained?

So, comrade Deputies, as of 1010, 412 deputies have now registered to attend the session. By a majority of votes—15 against, 15 abstained—the decision on the proposals of the Supreme Soviets of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian SSR's on the transfer of these republics to financial autonomy is adopted by the Supreme Soviet. [applause]

I now submit for discussion the second decision...

[Unidentified deputy interrupting] Not for discussion.

[Lukyanov] For voting. No, we must agree first. This is a draft decision of the Supreme Soviet on the proposals of the Supreme Soviets of the Lithuanian and Estonian SSR's on the transfer of these republics to economic independence. You have the text. The commissions have discussed only these two draft laws and, as you recall, have worked out a draft law, on which work will continue. There is no doubt that the work must be accompanied by economic computations, taking in all regions and all republics. The question must be considered in all its ramifications. It is proposed, therefore, as you can see, to approve the main provisions of the draft law, which has been considered in the commissions, and to instruct the Committee on Issues of Economic Reform, and the Committee on Issues of Legislation, Legality, Law and Order, jointly with representatives of other committees and commissions, the groups of deputies from the Lithuanian and Estonian SSR's, and the USSR Council of Ministers, to prepare and to submit to the Supreme Soviet by 1 October 1989 for examination a draft law that has had additional work done on it, taking into account the criticisms and suggestions voiced by all USSR people's deputies, including today's criticism about a mistake in costing these measures.

[Romanenko] Deputy Romanenko from Kiev, Anatoliy Ivanovich, are these two independent or interconnected documents? The point is that we have adopted a decision on transferring the republics to financial autonomy.

[Lukyanov] Yes.

[Romanenko] If we adopt this decision with a smaller number of votes than the other one, will it come into force or not?

[Lukyanov] I want to say that these are two independent decisions. One of them, as you said yesterday, gives the green light in the three republics for measures to transfer them to financial autonomy. That is a decision that will come into force immediately, and so on. The second decision is of an organizational-preparatory nature. We have approved one version of the draft law—its main provisions. We must continue that work in commissions, as is envisaged by our time rules for the passage of draft laws. Moreover, the precise formula of these time rules has been observed: In the first reading, the Supreme Soviet approves the basic provisions of the draft and forwards the rest to the commissions for additional work. In other words, we are fully in keeping with our standing orders.

Are there any other comments?

Someone wants to speak on the voting procedure. We must let him speak. Go ahead comrade Yudin.

[Yudin] I have the following proposal to make. In view of the fact that yesterday, during the discussion, there were no fundamental objections to the draft and that the provisions of the draft are not, one could say, geographical in nature—that is, they are not tied specifically to these republics—I propose that the word "these" be removed from the title of our decision, so that it reads as follows: On the proposals of the Supreme Soviets of the Lithuanian and Estonian SSR's on the transfer of republics to economic independence, and that the first paragraph should read: ...of the law on the transfer of—omit "these"—republics to economic independence. In other words, there will be a general draft law common to all republics.

[Lukyanov] Thank you. I take it that everyone understands what deputy Yudin is saying. [applause] I want to add something, comrades, to what we are talking about here. What we are saying is that if we—the commissions, together with other republics—come to the conclusion during the second reading deliberations that we have to drop "these republics" and adopt the bill fully or extend its scope by that point in time—the Belorussian delegation is also preparing to switch to full financial autonomy and self-financing—or there may be an autonomous republic—Bashkiria, in particular, is currently carrying out such experiments—that will come to this conclusion, we will have an opportunity to make amendments, but amendments based on the views of the commissions and on careful study. After being agreed with the commissions and the republics, such amendments will not be tabled during a discussion like this about a propopsal arising merely on an ad-hoc basis. I think that we should vote on the commissions' proposals—what is proposed to us in the agreed draft. Then, if necessary, let us put the second proposal to the vote. No objections, comrades? Have you got a proposal on the draft law? Go ahead, then.

[Unidentified woman deputy] We are talking about the main provisions of the draft law. It is proposed that economic independence on a unionwide scale be approved by the Supreme Soviet in its main provisions, but without going into any details. Thus, these main provisions will be identical for all republics. Why should we have 10 goes at tackling something we can do the first time? In this case, if we are going to approve the main provisions of the draft law, common ones for all the union republics, we should effectively pass this stage and make faster headway.

[Lukyanov] Thank you. Let us examine this proposal on the general provisions, as well. So, what is involved is approval of the main provisions of the draft law formulated by the commissions. When one or another draft law is being spoken about, and a major draft law which was tabled by the USSR Council of Ministers... [interruptions from the floor] Yes, this is a very major draft which has already been widely discussed by the population. We must, all the same, consider it. It was tabled by the USSR Council of Ministers. Then after a process of consideration, perhaps we will pass a single act or will bring in this act. But we have been required by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies to consider this draft issue tabled by the two republics by way of a legislative initiative. We must fulfill this congressional requirement.

For this reason I would like to answer like this, if there are no objections: Let us put to the vote that draft which was agreed and tabled by the commissions. Are there no objections? I put to the vote the draft decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the proposals of the Lithuanian SSR and the Estonian SSR on the transition of these republics to economic independence; of these republics to economic independence. I ask those who are in favor of this draft agreed by the commissions, representatives of the chambers, and delegations from the republics, to raise their identification cards. I ask them to lower them. Who is against? I ask them to be counted.

Thirty five. Who has abstained? Please raise your passes. So, comrades, 412 deputies took part in the vote. Thirty five voted against, and 23 abstained. The decision on the proposals of the Supreme Soviets of the Lithuanian and Estonian SSR's on the transfer of these republics to economic independence has thus been adopted by a majority vote of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Brazauskas Statement on Baltics Bill 26 Jul

LD2707131189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Statement by Deputy Algirdas Brazauskas; from the recorded relay of the 26 July evening session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Text] Esteemed Supreme Soviet: Undoubtedly, no more motivation is needed if we are talking about this bill. Yes, the Baltic republics have their own additional motives. These motives have been stated by Comrade Toome and other comrades from the Baltic region. I can only join in and say that, apart from economic motives, we also have very serious political motives.

Yes comrades, we are now discussing something new and unconventional. Such things in the republic as pricing, the solution of social issues, autonomous finances and credits, foreign economic relations, and so on are not accepted somehow in our economic lexicon. But comrades, a light has appeared at the end of the tunnel. Let us not extinguish that light. It is not that this light has appeared from the direction of the Baltic region. Perhaps many think that this pursues some kind of purely economic, perhaps some kind of separatist aim. Not by any means! Here much has been said about the integrity of our country's economy. Yes, we also affirm that we are not by any means trying to infringe on that integrity—at least as we have it today in its natural form.

Many questions have been raised on subordination. Of course, one is surprised by such a question. Perhaps, in fact, these questions do arise regarding this bill. Perhaps they arise because some speakers today are not acquainted with all the main concepts of economic financial autonomy and with other additional materials which were drafted in Estonia and in our land and that were widely discussed.

Yes, union industry somehow agitates everyone, and us too. Yes, 35 percent of all industrial output is in our land [u nas], presumably produced by industry of union subordination. But comrades, there are such forms of subordination, or rather I would say nonsubordination, which have already been acknowledged in our country and are already practiced, in Leningrad and in Moscow alike and in other regions of our country on a nondepartmental status, or rather a nonsbordination, nondepartmental status of enterprises. We consider this quite a natural form that will gradually move to this part of industry and that will be entirely able to function.

We have not invented this principle. We have consulted for a long time with enterprises and heads and soviets of enterprises alike. Basically everyone is coming to the conclusion that it will be able to exist normally.

Further, comrades, there are many questions of course because the very idea is a new one. Here there have been long arguments. I agree with the others that in deciding and adopting—not adopting, rather debating—this bill, many ideas and many doubts have cropped up. The question of ownership, for instance. Good. Many experts in law and economics have spoken here and all of them have a different approach to this question. So let us not forget the time factor. We must now continue the debates. Unfortunately, they have already been continuing for long years, and so far we have not seen any alternative proposals for what we have proposed. The question needs to be solved; therefore, we believe that these objects of debate remain objects of debate. But let us not link them with the bill on economic autonomy. They must be radically solved in our country and, of course, as they are solved, they will be applicable in the appropriate way to these bills. Therefore, today, after an entire day of debate and discussion, we ask you, esteemed Supreme Soviet, to take a very serious look at our legislative initiative—at this bill.

I have a few more small addenda that I would like to bring to the deputies' attention:

Article 2, Paragraph 1. Add the sentence: Enterprises may autonomously conclude contracts with economic partners and enter, on voluntary bases, into republican and interrepublican associations.

In my opinion this is very good and sheds a lot of light on this question.

The last thing I want to propose, and this is our common opinion, is point 6, which has provoked much debate. This concerns points of the USSR Constitution. This is the entry that is proposed in place of paragraph 1 of Article 6:

It should be established that legislative acts of the USSR regulating socioeconomic relations operate on the territories of the republics indicated in so far as they do not contradict their transition to economic autonomy. Questions concerning the Constitution should be removed from the draft resolution.

Comrades, of course the center bears a big burden of responsibility and great power. Let us share this burden and this responsibility. I think it will only be easier for us. I ask you to vote for this bill.

Abalkin Addresses Supreme Soviet Session

LD2707150189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Statement by Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin; from the recorded relay of the 26 July morning session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Excerpts] Esteemed Comrade People's Deputies: As we examine the issue under discussion, and also the other problems that the Supreme Soviet has been examining recently, we must not forget the general ideas of the goal of our perestroyka. [passage omitted] It is important merely that this path should be trod thoughtfully, competently, with political wisdom, and without extremes and mistakes, and, at the same time, without marking time. If one is to speak of where this path is leading us, I would name three aspects, above all. I think that, first of all, it blends in with the general process of the democratization of the public, sociopolitical, and economic life of the country—and there is no democratization without the development of these principles of financial autonomy. Secondly, it is the strengthening of the links between the actual results, the end results of economic activity, and the actual standard of living of people in the work collective, the oblast, and the republic. These things must be linked together and leveling tendencies and feelings of dependence must be overcome. Thirdly and lastly, this is connected to the objective process of the rise in national self-awareness in various regions and formations in the country.

At the same time, when building the system of economic financial autonomy, one must be clearly aware that the stability of such a building is determined by the stability of the foundation. A pyramid must be built from the bottom and not from the top. A building must be built not from the roof but from the foundation. And the foundation of financial autonomy in all formations is full financial autonomy of the main link in the production chain of the economy. Without this, none of the rest will work. [passage omitted]

How are we to reach this path? Of course, the most logical path is to begin by determining general principles, the general basics, which must, of course, be very significantly modified and altered in accordance with the sizes of the republics, their specific features and traditions, and preparedness for these matters [passage omitted] We must begin from 1990, no matter how long we discuss it. We can conduct yet another discussion, we can prepare a draft law on ownership, put if forward for nationwide discussion, debate for 2 or 3 months; perhaps this may be needed, and perhaps yet more work might be required after this. But in all the talks we might lose the energy for action and postpone it for an indefinite period. As far as I can judge from the situation, the sociopolitical situation in both Estonia and Lithuania is such that it is out of the question for us not to begin their transfer to financial autonomy in 1990. So we have a situation where we will, evidently, have to work, as I see it, in two areas at once. First, we must work out the fundamental initial laws of the Soviet state [words indistinct], not calculated until the sping of next year or for 1 ½ years, but rather the fundamental and basic legal status of the Soviet state, worked out in detail. And at the same time, there must be a working plan for the transfer from 1990. This distance cannot be covered in one leap. The burden of accumulated problems is heavy. Complex solutions are required. [passage omitted]

Economic Autonomy Discussed

LD2707111889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Galina Vinogradova will present today's bulletin, but we shall open it with a direct report from the Kremlin where sessions of two Supreme Soviets—the USSR and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]—are under way. First, our colleague Igor Zorin will tell us about the USSR Supreme Soviet session. Can you hear us, Igor?

[Zorin] Yes, good morning.

[Announcer] Good morning, Igor. All of us listened with great interest well after midnight to debates on the proposals submitted by Estonia and Lithuania about republican financial autonomy. What has happened, has the voting on this question taken place yet?

[Zorin] The voting has taken place but I would like to say that the work continued during the night, too.

[Announcer] Yes?

[Zorin] Yes. So far, the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is in its third hour without a break. The session is chaired by Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov. At the very beginning of the session he proposed that the examination of questions be completed, those questions that you have mentioned. They were practically completed late last night. We are talking about, I repeat, about proposals of Baltic Republics on their transition to financial autonomy. Today, the supreme parliament of the country adopted two very important decisions. [passage omitted]

What reactions have been caused by these decisions? For the most part, they have been positive. As always, I would like to say, Deputy Burlatskiy expressed his political position as a leading citizen. He also proposed that one more decision be adopted that proceeds from this, a decision of the Supreme Soviet to recommend to parliaments of union and other republics, autonomous oblasts, and okrugs to prepare and submit for approval local draft bills on their transition to financial autonomy as soon as possible. This has evoked a general approval and this initiative has been supported by many deputies. And now comrade Burlatskiy, as the initiator—he is from Moscow—Moshnyaga from Moldavia, and Ismailov from Azerbaijan will be preparing a draft of such a decision together with the committee for legislation.

[Announcer] I understand.

[Zorin] Deputies have only just completed—yes, I am asking my collegue—completed the examination of several decision of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and after the break they will return to this question again, they wil be approving the so-called four controversial decisions and in the evening they will examine nominations for the post of the first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers on agroindustrial questions and the post of chairman of the USSR State Committee on Prices.

What is going on today at the all-Russian session, also being held here in the great Kremlin Palace? Olga Vasilenko has only just arrived at the Supreme Soviet building, and she has all the news about the all-Russian parliament's work.

[Vasilenko] The first news: The agenda on the tasks of Soviet and economic organs on the increase of production and improvement of quality of consumer goods, in harmony with directives of the Congress of People's Deputies. The interesting fact is that the session opened somewhat unusually—no list of speakers was prepared in advance and the chairman invited deputies to put their names down. In addition, several microphones have been installed in the hall and the vote counting commission [schetnaya] has been elected, although previously there has been no need for it.

[Announcer] Following the example of the Supreme Soviet.

[Vasilenko] I am awaiting further developments with great interest. So far deputies have only approved the agenda, unanimously. Thus, there has been no need yet for the vote counting commission. It is possible that the examination of problems of consumer goods in commissions will expose the situation which exists with these goods even further, and voting will be necessary on the solution of important questions.

[Announcer] Yes, and debates will, no doubt, be heated.

[Vasilenko] I think that they will be, yes. Because Deputy Vlasov, chairman of the Council of Ministers, spoke, and commissions' reports were presented—very sharp, critical reports, by the way. Debates have now started. As you know, the situation with consumer goods is very difficult. (?Cost) indices of the 3-year plan have been fulfilled, but the market has not received 22.5 million pairs of shoes, 800,000 television sets, 500,000 sewing machines, and there is a shortage of 168 million razor blades. This is the situation. Thus deputies have started discussing all this and they are in a very militant mood, although [word indistinct] perhaps wanted to put forward a different agenda but have realized what a catastrophic situation there is with consumer goods.

And something else is interesting. I have met a group of people's deputies and they have told me that they intend to come here to the Russian deputies. And so I think that the work will be very interesting. This is my news.

[Announcer] Thank you very much. We shall follow the work of the sessions. Thank you. That was our correspondent reporting from the Kremlin.

Deputies View Economic Autonomy

LD2707125989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Report by Marina Novitskaya from the USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin—live or recorded]

[Text] I think that today has brought joy to the deputies. As you know, all day yesterday the USSR people's deputies discussed the Baltic republics' proposal on their transfer to financial autonomy. One cannot say that the discussion was without conflict. Not everything in the proposed draft law satisfied the Supreme Soviet. However, all recognized the adherence to principle of this step in the radical reform of the country's economy, and this morning, with an absolute majority of votes, the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a decision in which it approves the proposal of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia on the transfer of these republics to financial autonomy beginning 1 Janaury 1990. The decision also points out that all-union legislative acts that regulate economic relations function on the territories of these republics only in so far as they do not impede transfer to financial autonomy.

I think that you will be convinced that my feelings about the significance of what is taking place are correct by listening to the brief words that People's Deputy Yuriy Shcherbak felt the need to address to his colleagues.

[Begin Shcherbak recording] I voted for both of today's decisions, and as I understand it, today is a historic day in the work of our parliament. We were voting not only for the Baltic republics' financial autonomy, not only for their economic independence: we were voting for perestroyka, and I want to congratulate the fraternal peoples for the fact that our decision has been adopted, but as I understand it, all the remaining republics will soon go

along this road because yesterday I was both envious that it was not the Ukraine which came as initiator of the transfer to financial autonomy, and a bit ashamed that we have fallen behind. Therefore, I think that this is of very great historic precedent, significance, the decision adopted by us. [end recording]

Yuriy Nikolayevich mentioned two decisions. I will now explain. The second decision concerns the draft law put forward by the supreme soviets of Lithuania and Estonia on the transfer of these republic to economic independence. The concept of economic independence, in the view of the majority of deputies who took part in discussion, is a great deal broader than financial autonomy, and not all the clauses in the draft appeared acceptable to the deputies. Therefore, work on them will continue. But in the first reading the Supreme Soviet approved the main provisions of the draft law, and passed it for additional work to commissions. Moreover, the period of time has also been established for this additional work. The refined draft should be submitted to the Supreme Soviet by 1 October this year. This decision was also adopted by a majority of votes, but the importance of the transfer to economic independence by republics and regions is so obvious that new proposals have already come in this morning. Here is how Deputy Burlatskiy formulated them:

[Begin Burlatskiy recording] Comrades, yesterday, we, with Sergey Sergeyevich Alekseyev, the chairman of the Committee on Legislation, discussed the question regarding other republics: in what form we can react to the universal demand, perfectly legal and natural, (?which has increased) from representatives of all republics, to join in the process of preparation of economic reform and transfer to financial autonomy. In this connection I put forward the proposal—incidentally, we had in mind with Sergey Sergeyevich to include it in one of the drafts of the decision, and then decided not to introduce difficulties into the passage of these drafts, and therefore I submit the proposal to adopt a separate decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in approximately the following fashion: To recommend that the Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers, union, autonomous republics, oblasts and krays, prepare proposals and introduce draft laws on the transfer to financial autonomy in the shortest possible time. I think that this could stimulate the work of all republics, and could give into the hands of those comrades who favor this the weaponry to overcome the conservatism which still exists among the leadership of republics in a number of places. We would nudge the process on.

It was decided to do this. The Supreme Soviet then moved on to confirming decrees of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. First it was decided to confirm those of them over which there are no serious remarks. Up to the break the deputies succeeded in confirming the decree on reducing the USSR Armed Forces and expenditure on defense during 1989-90. I will only add that it is being proposed to concretize one of its clauses and to instruct the government, by 1 january 1990, to consider the question of reducing... [corrects himself] sorry, more correctly, of the retaining by those being discharged from the armed forces of allowances for a period up to 1 year, that is, wages. This, of course, will make it easier for many in the transfer to other types of activity. In principle the deputies are in agreement with this. It is only necessary to think about from what resources these sums will be allocated. Such a more precise definition will be made. Also confirmed have been decrees on expanding the rights of collective farms and other agricultural cooperatives in the matter of disposing of housing funds which belong to them; on certain questions connected with the creation and work of joint enterprises—here the matter is about the privelege and assessment tax of these enterprises and associations, and in particular in the far east region.

The session is continuing.

Lithuanian Deputy Queried on Financial Autonomy

LD2707181589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 27 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast: special correspondent Sergey Medvedev report from the Kremlin on the joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin on 27 July, including lobby interview with Kazimera P. Prunskene, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers—recorded; interlocutors identified by screen caption]

[Excerpt] [Medvedev] I believe that everybody who followed attentively the proceedings at yesterday's sitting now is waiting impatiently to see how the turbulent discussion of proposals from union republics on the transition to financial autonomy ended. Today, the Supreme Soviet decided to approve these proposals. That means that Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will go over to financial autonomy beginning 1 January 1990. The decision for them to prepare for the transition to economic independence was adopted at the same time.

Kazimiera [name indistinct], first and foremost, I would like to congratulate you on this decision, but of course, I also would like for you to dispel certain fears—one of the first being that this decision and your proposals were dictated by political considerations, more than by economic ones.

[Prunskene] I would reject the word more, but the fact that there is a connection is obvious and indisputable. If you apply it to other republics outside the Baltic region as well, that connection will be revealed because it is about the division of powers between the center and the republics. That, in my opinion, also has a political aspect. If we are talking about external economic ties, there is a political side to this as well, to a certain extent,

although we are not dealing with an independent external policy. Therefore, there is a connection, but it is not as absolute as some people want to present it.

[Medvedev] does the adoption of this decision mean that enterprises that are subordinate to the union—all enterprises, any of them—will become the property of the people?

[Prunskene] of course, the collective of the enterprise will remain the owner, to a greater degree, but this trend is now being traced clearly throughout the country. In my opinion, what remains for us to do is to clarify issues relating wholly to the economy and to ownership within the framework of the whole Soviet Union.

[Medvedev] Is there not an element of social injustice here, such as the view that the enterprise is subordinate to the union; it was created by the whole country, but it suddenly transfers to ownership by a union republic?

[Prunskene] Injustice would arise here only if, say, Lithuania or Estonia were to take too much in this area, but since the people of both Lithuania and Estonia participated in the creation of enterprises situated throughout the country—the Baykal-Amur mainline, say—and in connection with that, it is already being cancelled. In other words, we are laying down shares. If the share is equivalent to that people's contribution to property in the union in general, then in my view there is no frustration of the interests of other republics here. We have determined, by way of experts, with various evaluations, that this share is exactly equivalent.

[Medvedev] Are there not any contradictions, in your view, if your republic goes over to financial autonomy—and it is already clear that it will—in the fact that the State Planning Committee will be obliged to supply your republic, or to insure supplies to it, according to your republic's demand and dependent on the plans you present?

[Prunskene] If we take on the obligation to supply food, say, to other republics and to union stocks, then naturally, we also claim the right to receive resources, guaranteed, as a bilateral contract.

[Medvedev] well, the decision adopted today is unprecedented. There has been nothing like it in all our history. There is every reason to suppose that it will serve the political and economic strengthening, both of the republics and of our entire union. [passage omitted]

Maslyukov on Baltic Autonomy

LD2707215489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1548 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Remarks by Yuriy Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, from recorded relay of 26 July morning session of the Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade people's deputies; I have formed the impression that the document which was presented by the Council of Ministers has in general not been properly worked out, neither by the deputies nor by the commissions. This is very unfortunate from my point of view. Many questions, which we are disputing in the latest version of the proposals by the Council of Ministers, it seems to me were in a sufficiently acceptable interpretation for many republics, whose draft laws we are discussing today or are intending to discuss in the future; for example, if one takes account of the request (?in) the speech of the deputy from Latvia. But I would still like to dwell on some aspects which may bring some clarity. We have recently been very actively disputing the theme of what is the exclusive right of union republics to possession and usage, and the right of ownership. Leonid Ivanovich has already spoken about this.

We have formulated this question in such a way that the union republics sovereign rights of possession, disposal, and use of natural resources are secured. While discussing such categories which are more of a philosophical nature than ones that influence our practical work, I would nonetheless like to stress once again the important role which is given to both the union republic and the union as a whole. You see, it is very easy to cross the border which separates the understanding of the Soviet Union as a single whole to a confederate state into which [states] enter, and on a voluntary basis unite their resources in order to carry out some kind of aim. All the same we have common aims and tasks, of all of our republics, and we must implement these aims and tasks. They are very clearly formulated in the decisions of the congress and I cannot hold back from reciting them to you. Thus the congress: It is written in the decisions that in the system of economy, based not on administrative orders and commands but on economic methods of management regulated by law, the role of the center should create economic and legal conditions for effective economic activity at all levels; develop all-union infrastructure; conduct general state and scientific technical, financial, and tax policy; and ensure the protection of citizens. If we put the congress's decisions at the basis of our review, then I think that we could come to a completely different conclusion.

Now, further: In deputies' speeches the thought arises that those rights which are being given by the draft law of the Council of Ministers, introduced by the Council of Ministers, on republican self-financing and self-management and expanding their rights, that here there is insufficient economic independence. For this economic independence it is essential to completely nullify the ownership connected with either union ministries or rights of the union. I cannot agree with this because firstly [passage indistinct]...law which was discussed today [passage indistinct] what kind of rights of ownership the union has and what kind of rights of ownership the republic has, or rather, it is clear that the republic has all rights of ownership while as far as the union is concerned, there are mentions there about oil and gas pipelines and a little about the railways, and there a is bit more about which nothing is said. In other words, it seems to me that in the variants which are proposed by the draft decision - the

draft resolution, and the draft law of the Council of Ministers—it is very clearly defined here in every sphere. What can the talk be about at the first stage today, literally today. We are saying that the Baltic Republics are getting up to 70 percent of all property which is located on their territory. Outside remain only factories of union subordination which work in the interests of the whole of the Soviet Union; all the social sphere, all capital construction, all agriculture, all production of consumer goods which is carried out in the republic, including union factories if they distribute and sell the maximum quantity of their output inside the republic—all this is being transferred to republican ownership.

The republic is acquiring very substantial rights in the operation of finance and credit systems. Recently, by means of (?estimations), so to speak, and rather repetitive exchanges of views we concluded that the republics should be given a very large number of additional rights in regard to drawing up budgets and operating finance and credit systems. The question has been posed, however, in terms of all or nothing. I cannot agree with such an approach at this stage of our development, comrades. I think that...the council of Ministers commission has determined, determined very logically, all the sources of income in the union republics' budgets—in the present case, the Baltic republics, though in fact all the republics ought to debate this matter. So, if there is any need for any additional examination of this, nobody is stopping us from doing so, particularly in exercising the rights possessed by the USSR Supreme Soviet and its commissions. But for some reason the commission has tabled a draft law for two republics, completely ignoring the existence of a draft law drawn up though a common effort by all the union republics on this very subject. I think that examining these laws separately merely infringes the rights, so to speak, of the other union republics, while totally failing to attain the desire result. It is one thing when things are formulated for union republics with some sort of commonality, so to speak, in living conditions, culture, in the time they were created, and so on and so forth; however, it is impossible to do so without taking into account the needs of all the other union republics.

The last point to which I wanted to draw your attention, comrades, is this. At the moment we are thoroughly studying with the republics the questions of how to draw up the 1990 plan. Let us assume that the law now proposed is adopted—as has now been proposed by the committee—or else the law about which I spoke, reporting some of its content, is adopted, or else Comrade Abalkin's proposals are adopted: To what extent will this affect the formulation of the 1990 plan? I can tell you that today we virtually already have all the contours and all the indicators that we would like to include in the 1990 plan, and that adopting this law today will bring no benefit in regard to the formulation of the 1990 plan. The reason is that we have agreed on the basic principles for drawing up the 1990 plan on the basis of a combination of these three laws: the Law on Local Self-Administration, which has been tabled for examination; the Law on Basic Principles, that has been tabled to the Council of Ministers; and elements connected with the laws of the Lithuanian and Estonian republics tabled for your consideration today. That is, the basic points that can be decided in 1990 are clear to us today. It seems to me that this case is not one of principle, but of tactics. In principle, we are now able to draw up the 1990 plan together with the republics and agree on it right down to the last nail—I am speaking figuratively here, of course—nonetheless we can work out the plan in full. In regard to matters connected with political definitions, with a political consensus, so to speak, with political approaches to this issue, I think the issue must be examined on the basis of the formulation of which Leonid Abalkin spoke just before me—that is, on the basis of the principles that we must follow in shaping the work of our country's new legislative body, the USSR Supreme Soviet and congress. I would consider it premature to adopt now such impassioned decisions that could lead to unpredictable consequences both for the republics, for their mutual relations and for the union.

Baltic Autonomy Issues Debated

PM2807111389 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Jul 89 Second Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report: "At USSR Supreme Soviet First Session"]

[Excerpts] The first session of the new Soviet parliament is continuing its work. The members of the USSR Supreme Soviet met in the Kremlin on 26 July for a routine joint session of the chambers.

The session was opened by M.S. Gorbachev.

When planning the session's work for this week, he said, we set aside Wednesday for a discussion of the proposal by the Lithuanian and Estonian Supreme Soviets on the transfer of those republics to economic accountability [khozraschet]. Some time later similar proposals were submitted by the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet. Many comrades have come to Moscow from those republics, and so we have decided not to change today's agenda even though we have not finished discussing the question of ratification of decrees. We shall resume the discussion of that question later, but today there is a proposal to examine the proposals of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Supreme Soviets.

As you will recall, these proposals were submitted to the Congress and were presented to Congress delegates for familiarization, and the Congress then instructed the USSR Supreme Soviet. So in this instance we are acting in fulfillment of the Congress' assignment. In addition, two other documents related to this question have been issued to you today. There is the USSR Council of

Ministers and USSR State Planning Committee document "On the General Principles of the Leadership of the Economic and Social Sphere in Union Republics" and "On the General Principles of Local Self-Management and the Local Economy in the USSR." This therefore creates a certain context for the discussion of the question connected with the proposals from the Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian SSR delegations.

Those republics' proposals have been examined by the Committee for Economic Reform Questions together with other committees and commissions and by government organs.

The floor was given to V.M. Vologzhin, chairman of the Committee for Economic Reform Questions, to deliver the report. He said that the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet had instructed the Committee for Economic Reform Questions and the relevant commissions of the chambers to examine the republics' proposals on expanding their economic autonomy and, in particular, the proposals submitted under the legislative initiative procedure by the Lithuanian and Estonian SSR Supreme Soviets on the transfer of those republics to economic accountability as of 1990. The committee and commissions have done painstaking work in which leaders and specialists from those republics, L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR people's deputies took part.

Subsequently the committee chairman presented to the Supreme Soviet the agreed text of the draft law with amendments. He particularly drew the attention of the people's deputies discussing this important document and of the republics' Supreme Soviets and local soviets to the fact that during the republics' crucial preelection period the preparation of republic laws on the leadership of the economy and the social sphere and on local self-management and the local economy could have a beneficial influence on the consolidation of all formal and informal organizations and all working people in the solution of questions of vital importance to the republics.

Questions and comments were put to V.M. Vologzhin by Deputies G.S. Tarazevich, V.A. Yarin, V.S. Podziruk, Ye.V. Kogan, A.M. Umerenkov, G.M. Magomedov, V.A. Ivashko, R.A. Medvedev, V.D. Yudin, and others. Opinions on some procedural questions were also expressed.

The proposal to hear the representatives of the Soviet Baltic republics was accepted.

Deputy I.Kh. Toome, chairman of the Estonian Council of Ministers, takes the floor. [omitted passage]

After announcing that the next session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet will examine the concept of the republic's economic autonomy, Deputy A.A. Kalnynysh, director of the Latvian scientific research institute of the economy of the agro-industrial complex, expressed the wish to include Latvia among the regions to be covered by the law under discussion. Then the speaker proposed that each republic ready to switch to economic autonomy be given the opportunity to make its own laws without waiting for the formulation of the all-union documents to be completed. In his view the Latvian SSR right now needs to adopt at least 20 republic legislative acts that would enable it to exist successfully in a regime of autonomy. The deputy spoke in favor of the parallel preparation of laws both for the country and individual regions. In his opinion, the republics' legislative quest would make it possible to enrich this work at state level and would make it possible to overcome the destabilized situation in which our economy has found itself.

With regard to the idea expressed at the session that the republics which are first to begin acting in the new way may obtain economic advantages, the speaker cited examples demonstrating Latvia's considerable interest in commodity exchange and mutually beneficial cooperation with other regions of the country. At the same time he pointed out that his republic pays the highest rate of tax to the union budget and submitted concrete proposals to improve economic interrelations among the country's regions.

The need for the republics to switch to economic autonomy is obvious and hardly needs extra proof, K.-D.P. Prunskene, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers, said. The draft law, she stressed, taking issue with the comments heard in the hall, has been elaborated precisely within the context of the Union.

After dwelling in detail on the disagreements in the approach to the draft law under discussion, the speaker noted that they are deep-rooted and stem from a differing understanding of the essence of the unity of the national economic complex and the republics' integration in it. We believe, she stated, that the essence of unity is not in centralized administration and distribution but precisely in interrepublic equivalent exchange and the union market that we are creating. There are also differing interpretations of the idea of the subordination of enterprises and republics as well as of nationwide property and the role of the people as the subject of property. Our intention, the deputy pointed out, is to make that part of the property which we now call nationwide [obshchenarodnyy] truly of the people so that the people have direct access to it to use in their own interests.

We are moving, the speaker stressed, not against the tide of the perestroyka process but in its flow and at a rate faster than the average.

Talking about the discussion of the present draft law in parliament, the speaker reported that in the course of it many doubts regarding individual provisions of the document had evaporated. When setting out her principles the speaker pointed out in particular that the state order is acquiring new aspects because it is being transformed into a bilateral contract with reciprocal obligations.

The speech analyzed the reasons suggested by some opponents for the possible loss of deliveries from other republics in the transition to economic autonomy. They included the supplier's lack of interest because of low prices and the absence of a direct agreement on reciprocal supplies, and the loss of oversight on the part of ministries and central planning and supply organs. In this regard the speaker asked: Does the union have an interest in the Baltic region and its economy? If so, then surely that interest is not simply in the exercise of power but in the receipt of the end product for interrepublic exchange and of revenue for the state budget. If so, the republic is entitled to expect a mutual response in the supply of resources. We do not want handouts, this is a question of equal exchange, the deputy stressed. [passage omitted]

Speaking in the debate, G.I. Filshin described the draft law as a major boost to creative development and attitudes to work and output quality. He highlighted three key features in the document. First, the importance of republics' autonomy in their collaboration with enterprises on their territory and with the center on the basis of determining common national tasks. Second, the transfer of the complex financial system of taxation to uniform principles. In the deputy's opinion, the diversity of payments is one reason for the financial crisis in the country. And finally, the third feature, the Baltic republics' proposals will help link the interests of the population, the standard of living, and the level of utilization of production resources. And that, in the deputy's words, is the the only way to erect a barrier to wastefulness, a way that makes it possible to ensure that people have an interest in the end result of their labor.

It is time to place interregional relations on an equivalent footing, the speaker stressed, and we must not be afraid of complicating the relations between the republics and the regions. He noted that this required work in stages. Expressing the opinion of the majority of members of the Soviet of the Union Planning, Budget, and Financial Commission, the speaker proposed that voting on the draft be postponed for a certain time and that a deputies' working group be set up to remove certain contradictions existing in the draft law.

Agreeing on the need to transfer the republics to economic autonomy, Deputy A.I. Chabanov pointed out in his speech that the question has to be examined in the context of the common Soviet home. There are processes of integration under way throughout the world today, he stressed. We, however, lacking a strong center, could transform ourselves into a number of feudal princedoms. Therefore, this problem has to be tackled through integration and the creation of a strong center rather than the kind of center which, in the deputy's opinion, is envisaged in the law and which is to exist on handouts, as it were, according to the principle that it will get what we want to give it.

Further expounding on his perception of the problem, he noted that the level of democracy, including in the managerial-economic sphere, has to be enhanced. In his view, the country's wealth is represented by autonomous, economically strong enterprises, strong self-managing local soviets, strong republics, and a strong center. Our task is to breathe and create freely at the local level and have a strong center, the speaker said.

Touching on the history of the problem of economic autonomy, the deputy noted that a union of free socialist republics was created in the former domain of tsarist Russia after the revolution. Those who wished to leave the union had the political and economic opportunity to do so. But the later tragedy resided in the fact that during the period of the personality cult and stagnation we moved not toward democracy but in the opposite direction. That is the misfortune of all the peoples, not just those of the Baltic. The center became a rigid, essentially immoral and antidemocratic system of administration by edict. However, at the same time the USSR underwent a powerful development of its productive forces. In every republic very large resources were invested, cadres were trained, and economic ties were established whose rupture will pose a global economic problem. In the speaker's opinion, no single republic will be able to cut through these ties and ensure reciprocal financial payments in under 10-15 years. And if some republic, say, is able to do this, its economic efficiency and competitiveness will substantially decline. Therefore, the deputy pointed out, the elimination of the center or downgrading of its significance and virtual economic rupture are a disastrous path. He considers it more productive for the congress to adopt at first an all-union law establishing the distribution of the rights and functions of the center, the republics, local soviets, and labor collectives, and then for the republics to adopt solely on this uniform basis their own laws which take account of their particular features.

We are beginning historic work—the discussion of fundamental questions concerning the reconstruction of our economy and society, Deputy F.M. Burlatskiy stressed. Did the presidium, which submitted this actual draft for examination at the session, act correctly or should a draft on common principles have been introduced? In response to this question the speaker pointed out the great importance and relevance of the document under discussion, which can be judged from the deputies' reaction.

We should not go into the detail of the problem of whether the Baltic republics have run ahead of the other republics or not, the speaker said. Let us, he said, consider that others have posed this question. It is necessary to construct a building from the foundations up, not from the roof down, and not to argue over who is in front—the cart or the horse. In this case it is the horse—that is to say, republic economic accountability.

Analyzing the reasons why economic reform has not moved forward in the space of 4 years, the speaker pointed to the fact that we have long accumulated specific experience of the Stalinist-Brezhnevite administration-by-edict system. And this could not fail to affect

the current situation. A socialist political economy was unable to spring up on this basis. We need new experience. And it is now starting to take shape. The fact that the Baltic republics are taking the risk of experimenting deserves every possible support.

Each person, the deputy noted, is probably now asking himself deep down who will be the winners and who will be the losers as a result of the implementation of the proposed measures, whether things are moving toward the breakdown of our federation, and whether the Baltic is leaving the union. Dispelling these fears, the speaker said that this will not happen because everyone will benefit from the economic experiment. The task now is to create a new type of federation in which each republic can find its place and satisfy its legitimate economic, political, cultural, demographic, and ecological interests.

The session has decided to adopt this year the laws termed priority laws, Deputy P.G. Bunich said, not in order that they may operate from the start of the next 5-year plan; they must come into force as of next year. Given these documents' fine titles, their "content" is exceptionally important.

Dwelling on the draft law on regional economic accountability, the speaker stressed the advantages of the option submitted by Lithuania and Estonia. Addressing the Russian representatives, the speaker noted that the republic has been slow to adopt a similar document. In Russia this problem is already "knocking at the door"—the Kuzbass decision to switch to regional economic accountability is an example of that.

We must rectify the situation in the country rather than going in for cosmetic repairs, the deputy stressed. The speaker dwelt on problems such as subsidies, prices, and ownership. There are republics which receive more from the union budget than they contribute, he noted. But there should be no doubt that the principle of internationalism is our supreme principle. We must continue to help certain regions. The discussions about certain republics living off others cannot be considered correct. He stressed the importance of the concept of republic ownership. This does not eliminate the concept of union ownership.

Deputy V.I. Lisitskiy supported the draft law. At a time when the country has not yet organized a market relations mechanism, he said, any rash step could lead to infringements of working people's rights. The draft under discussion is part of perestroyka and is a specific and well-considered step on the path of implementing the economic reform. In fact, as is clear from articles in the draft law, both republics pledge to carry out all their economic and financial obligations toward the Union.

In synthesizing the new economic mechanism, which should be based on the independence of extradepartmental enterprises, organizations, and farms, and guaranteeing that this step will in no way damage the Union, the speaker stressed, Lithuania and Estonian are quite naturally requesting a certain amount of freedom of action in their own republics. This bold step, in the speaker's opinion, deserves every possible support.

Stressing the importance of the documents under discussion, Deputy V.A. Yarin stated that he would nonetheless be voting against the introduction of republic economic accountability as of 1990, and called on deputies fom Russia to support him. He explained his step by a desire to draw the Russian leadership's attention to the situation prevailing in the republic. A Kemerovo miner living in a 1930's shack could only dream of today's living standard in the Baltic republics, the deputy said. We are entitled to know how Russia, which is now in a serious state, will live in the future. This question needs immediate examination.

Deputy S.N. Fedorov noted that the law to be adopted will promote the overall development of our country since it asserts the independence of enterprises, people's liberation, their acquisition of various forms of property, and the multifaceted nature of the state. Otherwise, the speaker stressed, the bureaucratic-command system will remain.

Considering whether we are doing the right thing in giving special rights to two republics, the deputy drew the following analogy: In any battle the entire front never moves at the same time—the best-trained crack forces which have the best chance of winning move first. People's desire to be economically independent, in his view, corresponds with Marx' idea about payment according to labor—labor which each person should place at the disposal of the republics and the entire country.

Touching on the subject of integration, the speaker remarked that integration must not be based on the stick or on fear but be founded only on economic relations. The more we exchange the fruits of our labor, the more friendly we will be. Today, he said, ethnic questions too are reaching an impasse because republics do not trade with each other. They give everything up to those higher up and receive everything from the center. We do not have horizontal ties. Therefore many grounds for mutual rebukes and displeasures arise. In his opinion, economic accountability and the republics' creative life in the economic sphere will help to remove them.

The speaker went on to declare that he had heard no anxiety in deputies' speeches lest Lithuania and Estonia be ruined and made poor on switching to economic independence. On the contrary, he believes, envious fears lest they grow rich were heard, rather, between the lines. This comes from slavery. For a slave cannot stand it when another becomes free and wants him to remain a slave.

In conclusion S.N. Fedorov expressed the idea that the first experiment might not end in 100-percent success. But on the basis of this experience it is possible to create an efficient model of the country's development.

Deputy Yu.Kh. Kalmykov dwelt on some legal aspects of the submitted draft law. Expressing the general attitude to the idea under discussion, he pointed out, the experiments outlined in the Baltic republics should be approved. Everything should be approved except what is at variance with the USSR Constitution.

In the speaker's opinion, two problems transcend purely republic, regional economic accountability: the problem of ownership and the problem of the correlation between union and republic legislation. The USSR Constitution, for example, states that the land, the earth's interior, the forests, and water are the exclusive property of the state. But the proposed draft designates them as belonging to the republic's people. This problem requires more profound, comprehensive scientific study. It should be viewed, the speaker emphasized, in the context of the work on the law on ownership, as well as the preparation of changes to the USSR Constitution.

Speaking of the need to observe the supremacy of union over republic law, the deputy cited foreign experience of federalism. And this, he believes, must be taken into account when analyzing the path proposed by our Baltic comrades.

Today, Deputy M.A. Bocharov said, we are considering the draft of the most significant document during all the session's work. Questions of autonomy, the state order, and market creation give rise to no doubts. This must be done as quickly as possible, without waiting for the 13th 5-Year Plan. But the problem, in the speaker's opinion, lies elsewhere—in the form of putting the proposals into practice.

The deputy suggested looking at the document submitted by the two republics in the context of coordination with all-union interests, with the interests of all republics. He voiced the opinion that it is premature to adopt the draft law on economic independence for Lithuania and Estonia. It runs ahead of the main statewide legislative acts—which could entail unpredictable, negative consequences for the whole country.

There are variant readings in the submitted draft, the speaker remarked, and it is necessary to define more exactly a number of the formulations concerning, in particular, ownership and state enterprises. Speaking of price formation, the deputy emphasized that a unified state policy is needed in this matter. The market is the market, but the state must control a certain level of prices.

The speaker suggested modifying the draft with due regard for all the comments made at the session and clearly defining the republics' legal status in their relations and their legal protection. He voiced the opinion that what is needed is a law which will grant full independence to all enterprises, not to individual republics and regions.

The Baltic republics' proposal to switch to economic accountability as of 1 January 1990 must be warmly welcomed, Deputy S.S. Alekseyev believes. But the Supreme Soviet, the speaker declared, should adopt this law only in the first reading, as from the juridical viewpoint it still contains many omissions and discrepancies with other laws now being prepared. The first group of discrepancies, which still has to be cleared up in committees, concerns constitutional problems. However convincing the references made today to certain "moribund articles" in our Constitution, it remains the chief law for each of us.

It is also irregular to formulate in the law at once and without careful discussion the category of ownership on the republics' switching to economic accountability. In the speaker's opinion, it must not be exclusively republic ownership but, rather, joint ownership by the Union and the republic.

As a jurist, Deputy I.N. Gryazin touched on juridical aspects of the question under discussion. Speaking of economic accountability, he emphasized three aspects without which, in his opinion, economic accountability is just "another bookkeeping trick." They are the right of possession, the right of use, and the right of disposal. Explaining his idea, the speaker emphasized that under genuine economic accountability Tyumen oil must belong only to Russia, and Uzbekistan has the right itself to fix cotton prices. If the proposed price does not suit Estonian enterprises, they will be forced to buy less cotton. Likewise with gasoline—we will drive less if we do not know how to work.

Then M.S. Gorbachev read out the texts of two telegrams addressed to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet:

"We are seriously concerned at your 19 July speech at the first USSR Supreme Soviet session. Realistically assessing the country's economic position in the historic time of perestroyka, we beg you to read our appeal to locomotive teams and to all the country's railroad workers. The collective of the operating shop of Melitopol Locomotive Depot, which serves the Moscow-Crimea sector, advocates the implementation of more resolute measures in questions of perestroyka and calls for stronger technological and labor discipline. We appeal to all the country's railroad workers not to allow interruptions or stoppages caused by strikes in the country's transport conveyor belt. In the event of strikes, utter economic chaos and the contempt of the entire Soviet people await us. The text of the telegram was approved at a meeting of the labor collective of Melitopol Locomotive Depot's operating shop."

The other telegram was from Ussuriysk:

"Having discussed the state of affairs that has taken shape in the country as a result of acute regional conflicts on ethnic grounds, leading to casualties, and as a result of mass strikes, a meeting of workers and employees of

Ussuriysk Refrigerator Depot held on 24 July believes that the problems that have arisen require immediate solutions. It resolutely condemns violence, which brings pain and suffering to all Soviet people, as a method of resolving ethnic issues. During these difficult days for the country, it resolutely condemns strikes as a means of securing satisfaction for even the most just demands. It asks the USSR Supreme Soviet to read our appeal to all labor collectives, to all the country's working people. We believe in the Supreme Soviet. It has only just begun working and must be given time to elaborate fruitful decisions and to realize them, time to extricate the country from its crisis state. There is no place for violence in resolving ethnic problems. No strikes before 1 January 1990. On the contrary, work in labor collectives must be improved everywhere. Every strike is a blow to perestroyka. A dialogue instead of strikes, with all unresolved questions being monitored by USSR people's deputies and the Supreme Soviet."

The deputies expressed by applause their approval for the telegrams read out.

A.I. Lukyanov chaired the evening session.

The debate continued on the question on the agenda.

Speaking about economic accountability in the Baltic republics, Deputy V.Ye. Kurtashin, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Commission for Questions of the Development of Industry, Energy, Equipment, and Technology, welcomed their initiative, describing it as a revolutionary initiative that merits approval and support. However, he could not understand, as he said, the lethargy of such a republic as the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, which possesses vast scientific, economic, and political potential. We do not as yet have, he said, any legal acts regarding the transition to self-management of a republic, an oblast, or a local soviet. The speaker demanded that such legislative acts be submitted to the fall session.

The deputy voiced conviction of the need to create a well-balanced concept for the economic autonomy of the union republics. In his opinion, one must bear in mind the fact that such a concept cannot be outlined autonomously in isolation from the main trends in the radical economic reform, along with the fact that such a concept must take into consideration the correlation between the republic's independence and the economic management of the country as a whole.

The speaker then dwelt on an analysis of a number of the provisions of the draft law under discussion. He objected, in particular, to the transfer of direction of the monetary-credit and financial systems to the republics and to their determination of the basic principles for labor remuneration, pensions, and subsidies. Nor is the clause on free transfer of union ministries' enterprises and economic organizations to the republics along with all their fixed and circulating capital fully clear, in his opinion. Nor can one agree, he said, with the thesis regarding the nonapplication of individual items and articles of the USSR Constitution. A republic's economic self-management must be founded on the principles of the USSR Constitution, the speaker stressed, and the Constitution of the Union must not be tailored to fit the interests of the republics, as has been suggested.

To conclude his speech the speaker proposed that the law be approved at the first reading and that the Baltic republics, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the commissions be instructed to put the finishing touches to the document in accordance with deputies' speeches and to ratify it finally at the fall session.

The questions under discussion are of significance for the entire Soviet Union, Deputy Ye.Y. Vilkas said. It is in fact, he said, a question of a new model of socialism, a new state system for the USSR. But we cannot reach any opinion because, unfortunately, our understanding of these questions is still not very uniform. In this connection the speaker indicated the contradictory nature of certain critical statements. Setting out his stance in the leadership of the parliamentary commission which is tackling questions of the development of union and autonomous republics and autonomous oblasts and okrugs, the deputy stressed the importance of helping to ensure that the republics and other national formations receive the right to cater for their every need. There are great untapped reserves here, he pointed out.

The speaker voiced incomprehension at the objections to the republics having every complete right to implement socioeconomic policy. In this respect it is impossible to find arguments which would not at the same time be at variance with the universally recognized principles of self-determination, he said.

The deputy called on people to vote for the proposed draft.

During the discussion of today's draft law, Deputy A.N. Saunin noted, we have encountered a number of contradictions. First the formulation of the question "either-or" is wrong. Both must be examined. That is, a compromise must be found.

No one is calling the strategy of perestroyka and economic independence into question, so ways to solve the problem must be sought. The following question is often heard: Whom does it benefit? The republic or the union? It is quite obvious that the Baltic republics want to implement their economic interest. That is a good thing, the speaker reckons. All previous systems of economic relations were founded on priority for so-called nationwide interests. The essence of the administrative-edict system was the subordination of all interests to the interests of the state. But this concept is extremely woolly—for it includes both ministries and departments. In the speaker's opinion, it is necessary to proceed solely along the path of coordinating and creating a mechanism

in which both the republics and the Union as a whole would have an interest. Disputes over who gives more and who receives more are futile.

The following question arises: Why the Baltic and not other regions? This is the old psychology. The Baltic initiative has been brought about by objective factors, including the high level of production culture and the development of productive forces in this region. These republics' initiatives should constitute a reproach to other republics which have still not raised this question. All these contradictions can be solved. In the speaker's opinion, the republics' transition to regional economic accountability is the first radical step in the perestroyka of the economic mechanism.

Speaking about the specifics of Estonia's planned transition to economic accountability, Deputy M.L. Bronshteyn said that this step does not in any way violate the integrity of the economic complexes in the republics and the Union as a whole. The speaker does not consider the current state of the economic complex to be integral since it retains the diktat on the part of ministries which have retained their old functions—the functions of appropriating and redistributing the products of the labor of both enterprises and entire regions. In the deputy's opinion, the Baltic project will help combine republic complexes into an all-union complex. It is the start of the road toward an all-union integrated market where everyone is equal and where no one can dictate and demand special conditions.

In response to the question of whether the draft law on economic accountability for the Baltic republics jeopardizes state plans and the entire complex of relations between the center and the republics, the speaker showed from specific articles of the draft the reliability of the republics' guarantees regarding fulfillment of their all-union pledges. Moreover, he stressed, Baltic economic accountability is based on freedom for enterprises but freedom backed up by a clear system of regulators. Apart from the tax system, this regulation will include an innovations fund, antitrust legislation, and an enterprise support fund for those enterprises in difficulties. The socialist nature of the economy is fully retained and a system of social guarantees and social compensatory measures will be brought into operation. [passage omitted]

Deputy V.A. Karpochev voiced a sharply critical attitude toward the draft law under discussion, stating that it is not at all a question of regional economic accountability but "of economic and political independence" for the Baltic republics. The Supreme Soviet, the speaker said, must tackle problems of improving the life and activity of all the USSR's peoples rather than giving one people privileges over the others. The country is in extreme need of a transition to a new system of economic activity within a very short period, he said, but this must be simultaneous for all the republics and they must all have equal rights. [passage omitted] Today is one of the most significant days, one of the most complex and most important days in our work at the session, Deputy G.S. Igityan indicated. It is in effect a question of taking the first serious step in the economy. But at the same time it is also a question of trust in one another. How can we live in our home if we do not trust one another? I believe, the speaker stressed, that it is trust that is the basis of our cause and of society's progress.

We want to live like many other countries of the world live, he then went on to say. We are no worse than they are. Our people have proved this. Sharing his impressions of his trip to Lithuania, the deputy pointed out that he saw a surprisingly international attitude to visitors there. I think, he said, that Lithuania and Estonian are taking the first step. Let anyone who can do so take the next step. This law must be adopted for all the union republics and all autonomous formations. I want to ensure, G.S. Igityan concluded, that the words "I do not know of another country where man breathes so freely" become a reality.

Deputies I.N. Dyakov, M.V. Amanova, V.S. Advadze, and Ya.P. Lutsans also took part in the discussion.

The debate ended.

Chairman A.I. Lukyanov read the USSR Supreme Soviet draft resolutions on the question under discussion. It was decided to hold a vote on them at the next sitting after the finishing touches have been put to these resolutions in accordance with deputies' proposals and comments.

The joint meeting of the chambers was proclaimed closed.

The first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will continue its work 27 July.

Meetings of a number of USSR Supreme Soviet committees and chamber commissions were held the same day.

Supreme Soviet Adopts Decisions

LD2707154889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Excerpts] At the USSR Supreme Soviet. Commentator Ludmila Semena reports:

Today, 27 July, important decisions were adopted at the Kremlin on the transition of the Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian republics to financial autonomy, and the decision on the transition of the Lithuanian and Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic to economic independence. The commissions and committees of the Supreme Soviet together with the delegations from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia have been charged with drawing up and submitting to the USSR Supreme Soviet by 1 October a draft law taking into account proposals and comments.

Thus, an extremely important decision has been made. First, the instructions of the Congress of People's Deputies have been carried out. Second, the financial autonomy of the Baltic repubics, as was mentioned yesterday—yesterday the session was devoted to the discussion of this problem throughout the day—by Academician Abalkin, financial autonomy in the Baltic area only looks like a local problem today. Moscow, Sverdlovsk, the Kuzbass and other regions are already preparing for the transition to financial autonomy. Financial autonomy is part and parcel of the general process of democratization, strengthens the ties between the final result of labor activity and people's standard of living. And finally it combines with a growth in national awareness.

Summing up the results of yesterday's discussion, a number of deputies today proposed extending the decision adopted to all republics, but for the moment the decision has been deferred. But for all that, an important step has been taken. [passage omitted]

I think that the almost unanimous adoption of such an important decision had an effect on the further work on the deputies. They discussed a number of decrees of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium in a very business-like, constructive rhythm. Deputy Sokolova from the Committee of Soviet Women made a proposal regarding the decree on reductions in the USSR Armed Forces and expenditure on defense in 1989-90.

[Begin recording] [Sokolova] I think that the decree we are now going to discuss is of special significance. I would like to remind you of the sixties, when the country experienced such a reduction, but with a completely different approach, and the echo of that bitter reduction is still leaving its mark in the minds of tens of thousands of people. I think that today there is a special step, there is a special attitude to our Army, which has given a great deal of effort in defending our fatherland. I welcome such an approach.

But I would like to draw your attention to the fact that side-by-side with military people, without taking a military oath, but the oath of love and duty, women, as we say, are serving. These are the wives of servicemen. This period of reductions is not a simple one, and I would ask you, knowing how often you have manifested nobleness here, to have the ability to be just, kind. I would request you to enter into that decree not only military people, but concern to find jobs for the wives of servicemen. Believe me, they also find themselves in a highly complicated social and moral situation. I am appealing to you, dear colleagues, with hope and profound respect.

[Lukyanov] I think that Deputy Miloserdnyy has made substantial proposals on this very point, which is about to be tackled in the commissions, and we shall hand them over. We are thereby charging three commissions with investigating whether amendments need to be introduced into this decree. I am leaving the decree for confirmation. [end recording]

You will have understood that the session is being chaired by Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov. Decrees have been confirmed on the expansion of the rights of collective farms and other argicultural cooperatives regarding instructions on their housing stock and on the introduction of amendments and additions to the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium with respect to questions connected with the setting up on the country's territory and activity of joint enterprises, people's associations and organizations with the participation of Soviet and foreign organizations, firms and administrative bodies.

The deputies discussed in a very lively and interested manner the decree that is in effect on the confirmation of the statute on workers' control of trade unions. Listen to the proposals that they introduced into the statute on people's control.

[Begin recording] [Kozyrev] Deputy Kozyrev, Voroshilovgrad oblast. I would like to draw your attention to the controversy about whether some other kind of people's control, or trade union, or something else of the kind is needed. The miners' strikes showed that until now we never had any real control. And it is only now, on the spur of the moment, that they have carried out real people's control. Consequently, it is a question of which measure of control, irrespective of whether it be called trade union, or workers' or peasant, or some other kind of control, to what extent it is independent of the state structure.

[Adylov] Adylov, member of the Supreme Soviet, Tashkent. I have the following proposal to make. Here it has been asked whether workers' control is necessary. Yes, it is necessary, but the question is following. How is it working today? In actual fact, today it has no rights. In my view, it does not possess sufficient juridical powers. And because of that it is without rights. There are scandalous facts when, Let's say, some shop manager does not allow workers' control to operate adequately, to the necessary extent, on his orders. It is my proposal that it should be invested with sufficient juridical powers.

[Lukyanov] All right. [end recording] [passage omitted]

At the end of the session there was an announcement about the meeting of the interregional deputies' group, which is to take place on Saturday and Sunday.

[Begin Zaslavskiy recording] Our meeting will take place at the House of the Cinema in Vasiliyevskaya Street. The meeting opens at 1000 on Saturday, 29 July. The Coordination Council has sent invitations to all deputies who have signed any of the group's documents. If anyone has not received an invitation then we request them to consider this announcement as an invitation to the group session. As has already been mentioned at the Supreme Soviet in the 19 July speech by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, all USSR people's deputies who wish can attend the meeting of the interregional group. [end recording]

Ryzhkov Addresses Supreme Soviet

LD2707231489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1701 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Speech by USSR Council of Ministers Chairman Nikolay Ryzhkov from a recorded relay of the 27 July evening session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Text] Esteemed comrades: Yevgeniy Maksimovich [Primakov] told you the essence of the matter. Indeed, we still have a few vacant posts in the government; while the Supreme Soviet has been meeting, we have been working on certain candidacies. Today we are submitting for your consideration what we have accomplished. Two candidacies are being put forward for consideration. The first is the candidacy for the post of first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who will also be the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Committee on Foodstuffs and Procurements. The second is for the post of chairman of the State Committee on Prices.

In respect to the first post, yesterday [26 July] at a meeting of two committees we discussed in the most detailed way the candidacy of Comrade Nikitin for first deputy chairmnan of the USSR Council of Ministers. There was a thorough discussion, and I would say that the discussion focused on the state of affairs in agriculture, the agro-industrial complex, and about urgent matters existing there. I think that this made it possible for the candidate—Comrade Nikitin, whom I hope you will now consider, and I will ask you to confirm him in this post—to take a deeper look at those issues that have emerged in our country's agro-industrial complex.

It would seem that there is no need to dwell in detail on the aggregate of problems that exist in our country's agriculture and the agro-industrial complex. We decided that of all the problems that exist...[Ryzhkov changes thought] But you have been in session, as they say, for over a month and every day you have been running into this or that problem regarding the national economy. There are very many problems, and it is quite obvious that we are not able to solve them immediately. Together with you we will have to—that is to say, the government and the Supreme Soviet—look very attentively at the priorities in developing this or that sector of the national economy in order to choose the most important to provide quick tangible results and make it possible as they say, to solve in sequence one urgent issue after another in our country.

In my concluding address, I said that we really need to arrange our priorities, but at the same time we need to think very thoroughly about these questions. I said, and I want to say to the deputies of the Supreme Soviet, that in my view the main priority in the material sphere of production—and I emphasize, in the material sphere of production—is the countryside. I do not belittle all the problems that exist in heavy industry, the chemicals industry, machine-building, and so on, but in my view the fundamental reasons for all our troubles and the fundamental reasons for the social tension that exists in our society at present are to be found today in the countryside. Therefore, however hard it might be for us in the future, and indeed difficult trials lie ahead of us—we will obviously have, as they say, to curtail certain programs and to reduce certain production programs—I think that we must give priority to the countryside. If we solve matters there, then we will solve very many of our people's problems. That then is the government's point of view regarding the country's agro-industrial complex.

Now a few words about structure. Yesterday you and I spent the whole day discussing the question of regional financial autonomy. There was a sharp discussion. I also share the view of many of the deputies who spoke that perhaps of all the matters that we have been considering recently this is the most serious issue—a global issue, which could, if it is tackled well and if it is tackled rationally, really get our economy moving from the viewpoint of efficiency. That is, if we find indeed those essential approaches in regional financial autonomy, so that both our federation, as they say, may live and at the same time so that each republic has the opportunity to really work and enjoy the fruits of its own toil.

Therefore, while supporting regional financial autonomy in principle, I also wish to express the firm conviction that regional financial autonomy is impossible without the transfer to the regions—that is, to the union republics—of agricultural matters. If they are again centralized upwards, as used to be the case in our country, I don't think that anything will come of financial autonomy. We must hand over the countryside and the agro-industrial complex to the complete jurisdiction of the union republics so that they can manage these vital areas of the national economy.

There are, of course, a number of questions that it is nevertheless essential to tackle in the center. We will not be able to postpone that either. I won't list the questions. They basically have either a purpose that has to be the same for all the union republics. They are scientific and technical progress, economic mechanisms, questions of price formation, and so on. At the same time we must, it would seem, tackle questions of inter- republican relations. We have very many inter-republican economic links of all kinds in agriculture and so a body must, of course, coordinate work on that level.

While considering the government's management structure, I reported that we had chosen to establish a state commission of the USSR Council of Ministers on food procurement. This was done for good reason, since there were suggestions that a ministry of agriculture should be created, and so on. We consider that while handing agricultural matters over to the regions and republics, we must have a body at the top that could talk and at the same time tackle those questions that the republics set for that body. A body of this sort must possess a certain amount of power. We think that no matter how difficult it is, this commission must be set up directly within the

Council of Ministers—not just in a ministry, but precisely within the Council of Ministers—and that the commission should be headed by a first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. That is our idea.

At the moment, the scheme has not yet been confirmed, as they say, by a state commission. It has been prepared, but bearing in mind that there was no leader for that commission we accordingly did not launch it, of course; we'll wait for a leader to appear. He must then examine everything and solve the questions. The questions are extremely urgent. You are aware that today is a busy time for agriculture and of course the fact that we have no leadership of the agro-industrial complex inevitably affects the national economy as a whole.

As for the candidature of comrade Nikitin—well, you have his card. He has been connected with agriculture throughout his life; he has an agricultural education, and he has, as they say, passed through all the stages of agricultural production. In recent times, he worked as a minister of agriculture, then as first deputy of the Agro-Industrial Committee of the Russian Federation, and as a minister of the Russian Federation. Those are the recommendations that I can mention. When we were holding discussions, we expressed to him many wishes of all kinds. Needless to say, his work will be very difficult, and very serious, but we think that his age, his education, and his practical work will enable him to manage this vital sector of the national economy.

That's all.

Supreme Soviet Discusses Nikitin Candidacy

LD2707154589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Excerpts] At the USSR Supreme Soviet session, we link up with the All-Union Radio correspondent's office in the Kremlin. At the microphone is Vladimir Korablev.

[Korablev] [passage omitted] At the evening session—it opened 1 hour ago—the deputies returned to the question of the formation of the government, or rather those vacant posts which have still not been filled. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, proposed to the Supreme Soviet members thta they approve Vladilen Valentinovich Nikitin as first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who would head the State Commission of the Council of Ministers for Food and Purchases. At the present moment his is first deputy chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Agro-Industrial Committee. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov noted that Comrade Nikitin had pased through all stages of agricultural production, and his experience, education, and his age would enable him to fulfill the duties entrusted to him successfully. The approval of Comrade Nikitin's candidacy was also recommended by the Committee for Agrarian Questions and Food and the Commission for Questions of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy of the Supreme Soviet.

Setting out his program, Vladilen Valentinovich Nikitin stressed that first and foremost a reply had to be given to the question of when people would start feeding themselves normally. But in order to solve this question, it would be necessary to carry out as quickly as possible a great deal of work linked with the fundamental restructuring of the whole agroindustrial complex. And here, as is known, a great many problems, both economic and social, had piled up, which need to be tackled as a package.

Comrade Nikitin's candidacy is now being discussed. A great number of deputies have put their names down to speak. But, once the question of confirming him in office is solved, the Supreme Soviet members will have to approve the chairman of the State Committee on Prices. Comrade (Sinchigov) Vyacheslav Konstantinovich, has been recommended to this office.

The Supreme Soviet session is continuing its work.

Prices Nominee Address Supreme Soviet

LD2807095889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Statement by Vyacheslav Senchalov, nominee for chairman of the State Committee on Prices; from the recorded relay of the 27 July evening session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Excerpts] Prices do not fully reflect socially necessary expenditures. We talk a lot about that. But we do not say much about the fact that consideration is not taken of the real correlation of consumer evaluation of various goods. And we do not say much about the fact that prices do not take into account the demands of the socialist market. I can say that fuel prices are about half the level of world prices. Full account is not taken of the social component in prices and the cost of labor in part of the social insurance. Approximately R30 billion go from the state budget. This narrows the frontiers of introducing new technology: labor is cheap, and it is not advantageous to introduce machinery. [passage omitted]

The biggest distortion in the price system is stil the fact that prices are not mutually related, and there are so-called subsidies, which are already approaching the R100-billion mark and are pressuring the whole expenditure section of the state budget and are reducing our room for maneuver in carrying out social spending.

What can be done? Well, it has been said that reforms must be carried out, and I think that the overall presentation of the congress and plenum are correct. But I should like to speak of some approaches to this reform. First, it must not be seen as a one-shot deal. Such large-scale imbalances cannot be eliminated at one stroke through prices without

being a burden on us. Second, prices must not be given priority today with the imbalance that has accumulated, because the weight of imbalance of the total amount of money in cash and non-cash circulation and goods is immense. So we need to put the emphasis on other elements promoting a calming down of the money market. This is the development of securities and, comrades, we must not forget the regulation of wages, because wages today have spilled over—they are growing two and three times faster than they used to, and this has not been underpinned by goods.

Now I would like to say that we need balance by sector, first and foremost. I will quote just one figure. Our Group B is 25-26 percent of the total volume of industrial output; in Western countries it is 30-35 percent. And just look—I am quoting this very important figure—while we are allocating only 1 percent of capital investment to light industry, it provides us with 10 percent of accumulations [nakopleniy]. So you can judge what a structural and volumetric imbalance there is, and how, if we raise prices, how far we must raise them, and how there will still remain a deficit and how great difficulties will still remain. So first of all we must master monetary circulation.

An important element in reforming prices is conducting the line of democratization. Today the State Prices Committee sets prices for 80 percent of output of production and technical designation, and 65 percent of retail prices for basic food and nonfood goods. We must expand the rights of the union republics to set prices. We must increase the list of goods on which prices can be set by republican organs. This is determined in general by the new approach to the sovereignty of union republics, the expansion of their rights and the determination of regional policy.

Fourth, price reform must not lead to losses of income for agriculture and the population. If it does not prove possible to regulate things directly through mutual accounts, gains and losses in incomes, then stabilization insurance mechanisms must be worked out.

Fifth, in connection with overcoming the closed nature of our economy and its entry into the world division of labor, we must, naturally, take account of the proportions of world prices in our prices. [passage omitted]

Supreme Soviet Debates Decrees, Endorses Nine

LD2707144289 Moscow TASS in English
1420 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 27 TASS—The Supreme Soviet today continued to consider decrees adopted by its presidium in between the parliament's sessions.

On Tuesday it endorsed nine of 18 decrees submitted to the current session, while returning two others—those on changing Soviet legislation on holidays and memorial days and on approving a statute on Soviet trading missions abroad—to parliamentary commissions and joint committees for a review.

Deputies today quickly passed yet another decree of last March on cuts in the Soviet armed forces and in defence expenditure in 1989 and 1990. It stipulates that the Soviet Army and Navy will be reduced by 500,000 officers and men and that conventional weapons will be scaled down substantially and so will be outlays on defence.

Unlike previous decisions to whittle down the Soviet armed forces, it envisages essential measures to provide discharged servicemen with jobs and housing. In addition, it instructs the government to consider continuing paying them their previous salaries for a year.

There was practically no debate also on yet another endorsed decree amending a legal act on joint ventures, including tax privileges for such business in the Far Eastern economic zone.

A keen debate unfolded, however, on a decree on leaseholding, as this new and progressive form of economic management has run into many problems, some of them due to imperfections in the decree.

Many deputies called for reviewing it, but a different point of view prevailed, that in favour of endorsing the decree in order not to slow down the spread of leaseholding, while binding the government to step up work to prepare a law on leaseholding, which will take into account deputies' criticisms and suggestions.

The most heated arguments were over a decree on income taxes on cooperatives. It was effectively a discussion about the role and place of the co-op movement, as opinions on it differ greatly among Soviet people.

Deputies presented conflicting views as well: Whereas some saw the decree as a means of "strangling" cooperatives, others described it as giving a free hand to cooperatives to pick the populace clean by charging exorbitant rates on their services.

The debate will be continued on Monday.

In the afternoon the parliament began discussing candidates for remaining vacancies in the government.

Estonia's Kogan on 'Political' Strikes

LD2707202989 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1439 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Statements by Anatoliy Lukyanov, USSR Supreme Soviet first deputy chairman, and Yevgeniy Kogan, deputy from Estonia, from a recorded relay of the 27 July morning session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Lukyanov] Wait! Deputy Kogan, do you want to speak on the motion or on the agenda?

[Kogan] I want to speak on the... switch on my microphone!

[Lukyanov] The microphone is on.

[Kogan] I do not think it is. Ah, it is on now. Thank you. I have a very brief comment to make, only a couple of words. I will not hold you up for long.

So, comrade deputies, today you have adopted a very responsible and, in my view, a contradictory decision. I imagine you thought it through carefully and you must take the responsibility for that. I wanted to say something completely different to you. For 3 days, in Estonia, in the city of Tallinn, strikes have been going on. As of yesterday evening... [Kogan changes thought] The strikes are political: No one is demanding soap, meat, bread, and so on. The strikes are political. They are linked to the infringement of civil rights. So, I would ask you to set up—incidentally, the strikers sent a telegram here with a request from the republic's government to enter into negotiations with them, but there was absolutely no reaction yesterday—so I would ask you to set up an independent commission to look into the human rights situation in the Baltic republics. That is all. [scattered applause] [passage omitted]

Legal Committee Chairman Discusses Labor Disputes
LD2807025889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Interview with Y.K. Kalmykov, deputy chairman of the parliamentary Committee on Issues of Legislation, Legality, Law, and Order by O. Vasilenko; date and place of interview not given—recorded]

[Excerpt] [Novitskaya] Well, the criticism [of deputies' work] is understandable and, incidentally, it is heard not only at the session. It seems very often to the electorate that deputies spend their time inefficiently, or rather not always efficiently. I won't say that that's always the truth of the matter, but the deputies themselves link these shortcomings largely with the continuing lack of a law on the status of a people's deputy, and standing orders for a session of the Supreme Soviet. Here are the explanations that were given on the subject by Yuriy Khamzatovich Kalmykov, deputy chairman of the parliamentary Committee on Issues of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order. Our correspondent Olga Vasilenko met him.

[Khamzatov] You see that now a very great deal of work has befallen precisely our committee because we are studying not only decrees but also future, long-term laws, and clauses determining the status of all commissions and committees. In other words, we must prepare the legal basis for the operation of all structural sub-units of the Supreme Soviet.

But, unfortunately, these day-to-day matters have really weighed us down and such documents, say, as the regulations regarding the commissions of the chambers and the committees of the Supreme Soviets we have to far been unable to complete—even though, on the whole, this document is ready. The committees and commission have made so many proposals to us that we have not yet been able to submit it for discussion and approval.

[Vasilenko] And does it not seem to you that the absence of some foundations is giving birth to this squabbling, which is suddenly flaring up, which you are obliged to hastily put out, extinguish?

[Khazatov] No! Of course, unexpected things do happen. Well, for instance, now, we have been ordered to draw up a bill on collective labor disputes. This has been caused by life, these strikes which have taken place in a few regions of our country, and we are now urgently putting the finishing touches to a bill—it is ready—it has been submitted to the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] and the USSR Government, but it has a very crude basis—we virtually rejected it, frankly speaking. And we set up a working group which at the end of this week is to submit this bill in a finished form.

[Vasilenko] We're very interested to know what you actually took as a basis? What will actually allow us to settle these most complex processes in our life?

[Khamzatov] Well we, for example, have tried to define precisely the participants in these disputes, these conflicts. We have proposed that the conflicting sides can be, on the one hand, bodies of labor collectives—the council of a labor collective, for instance, or a strike committee, this new body—and trade unions too, as long as they properly defend the interests of their collectives. So that was one of the problems, for example. Then there is the procedure for holding a strike. We discussed warning strikes. Before declaring a strike, the strike committee has to give written warning to the management, for instance, or the industry leaders. This is done in all countries. Then there are industries in which strikes cannot be held at all—or a list, to be more precise, of these industries. That issue was raised, too. Then there's the question of the consequences of the strike and what the strikers are paid.

[Vasilenko] So you mean the strikers also have [words indistinct].

[Khamzatov] Yes, of course. After all, to strike is a labor collective's right, and this perhaps should be stated plainly in the law. We are thinking of stressing in the draft law that striking is, in fact, an extreme measure for resolving labor conflicts and one that is totally unnecessary to society as a whole. But if a strike is declared, certain rules of behavior have to be observed, and for that reason one can divide strikes into legal and illegal ones. When these rules are observed the strike can be recognized as legal and normal, progressing along a certain path established by legal norms, and illegal if no rules are observed. Once again, these are standards adopted in all countries.

26 Jul Supreme Soviet Session Proceedings

Economic Reform Viewed

LD2607155889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 26 July broadcasts a recorded relay of the 26 July morning session of the Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

Gorbachev greets the deputies present; 403 deputies have registered. He then declares the session open and announces the day's agenda: A proposal by the Baltic republics for transition to regional financial economy. Gorbachev says that a discussion of issues left over from 25 July will also be continued. Gorbachev then gives the floor to Deputy Vologzhin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Committee on Economic Reform.

Vologzhin reports that meetings have been held with representatives of the Baltic republics on the question of financial autonomy. He names the various representatives from these republics who attended, as well as Abalkin, deputy chairman of Council of Ministers. Certain changes in the draft law were agreed upon, which he itemizes.

Gorbachev then tries to speed Vologzhin up as he goes through the various amendments to clauses. Gorbachev asks him what the report is called. It's title is the draft law on economic independence of the Lithuanian and Estonian republics. Gorbachev asks if there are any questions; Vologzhin reads these out and supplies his answers. These concern various technicalities on amendments.

Deputy Tarazevich asks a question from the floor about the amendment on land ownership and wonders whether it is counter to the Constitution. Vologzhin answers this and another question about lease-contracting and basic assets. Gorbachev intervenes; he thinks they are getting off the track of the main question about economic independence. Tarazevich asks about the tax policy of taxes. Vologzhin says this is covered by the amendment.

Deputy Yarin asks an indistinct question. Whatever it is, Vologzhin says he can't give an answer here.

Deputy Podziruk asks about irresponsible treatment of woodland and waterways. This is followed by another indistinct question from the floor. Vologzhin says an amendment to this was agreed upon yesterday; it concerns credits.

An unidentified deputy asks about "unrealistic economic plans" and Soviet prices of fuel on the world markets. Vologzhin says the law will apply to all republics.

Deputy Koryugin raises a matter regarding the economic reform committee.

An unidentified deputy then asks about the unadvantageous position of Central Asian republics. The deputy from Kabardino-Balkaria asks about distribution of limits.

Dagestan Deputy Magamedov continues the theme about whether the draft law on economic independence of Baltic republics will have an unfair affect on other republics.

Deputy (?Yashko) brings up the question of law on ownership, which was discussed yesterday, and complains that there are no basic principles on this issue. Vologzhin says that there is an instruction from the congress to discuss this ownership question.

Gorbachev then gives a 1-minute summary of what has been discussed so far.

Deputy Kirilov raises various questions about what kind of currency will be used in the Baltic republics: Will there be checks, bonds, etc?

Each republic will still have its own currency, Vologzhin says. Vologzhin replies to more questions from Deputy Kirilov about finances and sale of bonds.

Deputy Medvedev raises a matter of procedure, complaining that what the speaker has said is incomprehensible to non-economists in the hall.

Unidentified deputy says that it is premature to vote on this today.

Gorbachev says that a decision must be made on this issue in a union context, according to the instructions from the congress. Gorbachev wonders whether Deputy Abalkin and Maslyukov are present, because they will have something to say on these matters.

Financial Autonomy Considered

LD2607192789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1450 GMT on 26 July continues broadcasting a recorded relay of the 26 July morning session of the Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

Deputy Toome, chairman of the Estonian Council of Ministers, puts his republic's case for financial autonomy and how it will affect its relations with other republics. He refers to an Estonian Supreme Soviet session recently which adopted a decision on this issue. He believes that transition to financial autonomy by Estonia and Lithuania will be a good experience for other republics to study. He believes national pride could be a good thing if there is a prospect of turning Estonia into a modern cultural and flourishing country. There are unfortunately some people in Moscow and other places who want to discredit the idea of regional financial autonomy, but more and more people within the republic are rallying around this idea. Toome refers to the strategic industries which will remain subordinate to the union. He goes on to summarize the advantages of a policy of financial autonomy in various spheres.

At 1505 GMT Gorbachev introduces Kalnynsh to give a report on behalf of Latvia.

Kalnynsh speaks in favor of conducting an experiment on economic independence in various regions. He says economic links will continue between Latvia and other republics. Latvia will be able to aid less developed republics by establishing branches of enterprises there. Republics should have independence with regard to foreign currency. A more radical solution is called for to move decision-making from the center, Kalnynsh says.

At 1515 GMT Prunskene of Lithuania speaks in favor of republican financial autonomy. She foresees some complications in trade exchange with other union republics. There should be reciprocal supplies on the basis of equivalence. The Central Asian republics are mistaken if they think that economic independence for the Baltic republics will damage their interests. There is no danger of Central Asia becoming a mere appendage of the Baltic area, Prunskene adds.

At 1534 GMT Abalkin gives a resume of the history of perestroyka. He talks of plans to introduce financial autonomy in various regions. It is important to ensure good foundations for the new structure. The draft law on general principles of economic relations will be very important here. There are questions about the role of the center: For example, will it guarantee a minimum wage, regardless of local conditions? None of the laws presented today is ideal. They need time for further elaboration. Abalkin adds that the situation in the Baltic area demands urgent action. Action must be taken in parallel. Action must be taken for 1990, and the long-term prospect must also be worked out. Various models can be tried out in different republics and areas.

At 1548 GMT Maslyukov discusses the rights that are to be granthed to republics. He talks of the principles which should underlie these proposals. There must be more thought given to differentiation of rights between the republics and the union. The effects of the new proposals on the plan for 1990 have been taken into account to some extent.

At 1558 GMT a break is announced.

Baltic 'Prepared' for Financial Autonomy
LD2607192889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1559 GMT on 26 July resumes broadcasting a recorded relay of the 26 July afternoon and evening sessions of the Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

The relay begins with Deputy Filshin expressing support for the provisions of the Baltic proposal on regional financial autonomy. He says the Planning and Budget Commission passed the proposal by a small majority of 11 to 8.

At 1607 GMT Deputy Chabanov says that the tragedy of all the Soviet peoples is that the cult of personality turned a union of free republics into a command-administrative centralist system. Democratization is the key to the whole process of reform. He adds that friendship among peoples must be safeguarded.

At 1616 GMT Deputy Burlatskiy says the other republics have fallen behind the Baltic states, who have proposed this useful initiative. The reform must be pursued from the bottom up. The command-administrative system has delayed matters, but now the experiment merits support. We want a new federation based on new principles, Burlatskiy adds. Everyone will gain. He wants the topic of integration to be included in the draft.

At 1625 GMT Deputy Bunich says the document drawn up by Lithuania and Estonia is the better of the two proposals. He says we should not be afraid of using the term republican ownership—after all, we are dealing with sovereign republics. At the same time, all-union ownership will remain.

At 1637 GMT Deputy Lisitskiy says that the position of the young and pensioners must be safeguarded. The Lithuanian and Estonian contribution to the draft has been a constructive one. Hand over enterprises to the republics, and stop calculating who has contributed what to the country as a whole.

At 1645 GMT Deputy Yarin calls on RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] deputies to vote against the proposal. A Kemerovo miner only dreams of the sort of conditions that already exist in some of the republics. The RSFSR has fallen behind, along with the Ukraine and Belorussia; it has shouldered responsibility for the whole country.

At 1649 GMT Deputy Fedorov says that the basic idea behind the Estonian and Lithuanian proposal is the legitimate Marxist one of payment according to work done. The Soviet Union is a vertical system instead of a horizontally woven rug of interrepublican relations, as it should be.

At 1654 GMT Deputy Kalmykov says we ought to back the Baltic experiments. He doesn't want to be obstructive, but what about this business of the land, water, and underground resources belonging to the republics? He asks for more discussion on this. He also asks; and what about the jurisdiction of state laws?

At 1702 GMT Deputy Bocharov backs state price setting for staples such as potatoes. He says further study of the issues should be carried out. All the republics should have the right to financial independence, although there is no doubt that the Baltic republics are best prepared. Let's pass a law for all the republics, Bocharov says.

At 1714 GMT Deputy Alekseyev is interested in the legal aspect of the draft—the constitution should be regarded as sacred.

At 1722 GMT Deputy Gryazin expresses the fear that the document must lay down the right to own, use, and dispose of resources—otherwise the whole thing will exist on paper only. There shouldn't be a law on state enterprises—a law is the wrong vehicle. The center has usurped power that no one gave it, he adds.

At 1731 GMT Gorbachev proposes an adjournment, praising the course of the debate. Gorbachev says he won't voice his view at the moment, the debate will continue after the break. Two telegrams are read out by him. From Melitopol, a telegram from a locomotive depot says no to transport strike and yes to perestroyka. From Ussuriysk, a group of workers says the Supreme Soviet should be given time to draft appropriate legislation and propose that there should be no strikes in the country until January 1st 1990. Gorbachev calls an adjournment.

At 1737 GMT the relay resumes with coverage of the evening session, with Lukyanov in the chair.

Deputy Kurtashin says the concept of republican economic independence must be seen as part of economic reform in general. Previous hasty changes have produced a wage explosion at enterprises. There should be a state monetary and credit policy, without which problems will escalate. He wants further work on the drafts.

At 1749 GMT Deputy Vilkas says it is important to appreciate the Baltic republics' understanding of the new model of socialism. The basic question is one of giving the republics the right to earn what they need. He says he cannot understand the arguments against giving the republcs the chance to decide their own social and economic policy. The interest of the Soviet Union ought to stem from the interests of the republics, not some mysterious 16th republic. Vote for the draft, Vilkas says.

Deputies on Economic Autonomy

LD2607193589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 26 July continues broadcasting a recorded relay of the 26 July evening session of the Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

Deputy Anatoliy Saunin from Donetsk says that it is good that the Baltic republics are seeking economic independence. There should be no more subjugation of local interests wholly to the interests of the center. He says that the high level of development of production forces in the Baltic republics makes them suitable objects for economic independence.

At 1807 GMT Depty Mikhail Bronshteyn, Tartu State University, says that the concept of economic autonomy for the Baltic republics is based on an idea of partners cooperating within the USSR. The idea of an integral all-union market is important and there must be much freedom within such a new integral all-union market. Bronshteyn says that little is changing as compared with the previous 5-year plan: Nothing in the law threatens the interests of the entire union. The finances of the entire union must be improved to avoid total collapse of the economy. He says wages must not be allowed to run ahead of the rate of output of consumer goods, as is the case at the present time. The people want a decision on the issue of republican financial autonomy now. There must be no dillydallying: We cannot affort to spend many sessions debating the issue of ownership, Bronshteyn adds.

At 1820 GMT Deputy Dyakov from Astrakhan supports the proposals of the Baltic republics which are ahead of the RSFSR in terms of production relations. It is time now to change relations between the center and the republics in accordance with the USSR Constitution. If the republics are strong in an economic sense, so will the union be strong. Dyakov proposes introducing republican financial autonomy for the Baltic area from 1 January, 1990.

At 1826 GMT Deputy Amanova from Ashkhabad asks if all the country's regions are ready to go over to republican financial autonomy. Some parts of the country are advanced in economic terms, and some are backward. Turkmenistan has transferred to socialist economic from a feudal economy, bypassing the capitalist stage. This has affected the economic state of republics in Central Asia. Amanova says that Turkmenistan is on a lower economic level than the Baltic area. Not all republics, therefore, can go over simultaneously to republican financial autonomy.

At 1833 GMT Vitaliy Vorotnikov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, says that the idea of republican economic autonomy is to improve living standards in the baltic republics. Unfortunately, the draft law has been amended by the supreme soviet's committees and commissions, and deputies have not had time to study the changes. The process of the RSFSR going over to regional financial autonomy is a most complex one.

Vorotnikov continues by saying that by creating advantages for two republics, the USSR Supreme Soviet will be anticipating other laws that are to be adopted during the Supreme Soviet session. The principles for regulating the budget, financial, and money systems for the two Baltic republics concerned are not altogether clear. The Lithuanian representatives have mentioned the difficulty of determining who owes what to the center. However, economists must resolve this issue—financial autonomy could not mean, for instance, that the RSFSR can take the Baykal-Amur railroad for itself. Pricing policy must be improved if equivalent relations are to be determined. The draft law deserves support where it does not overstep legislative bounds which are currently in force.

At 1844 GMT Deputy Valerian Advadze from Tbilisi says that regional financial autonomy should enable each republic to act independently, bearing in mind the interests of the country as a whole. A strong center has proved disastrous in economic terms. The situation in the country is extraordinary and most difficult. There must be no arguing about whether or not this new draft law coincides with all the niceties of the constitution. The point is whether the republics are going to get economic sovereignty which they deserve. The peoples in the republics concerned, thirst for the opportunity of financial autonomy. Under restructuring, we must transform the union into something other than Stalinist federalism.

Further on Baltic Debate

LD2607203989

Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1851 GMT on 26 July continues broadcasting a recorded relay of the 26 July evening session of the Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

Deputy Aleksandr Gorbachev says that some points in the draft law will be seen as unfair by others in the country. Why should some regions have all debts written off, when others will be forced to bear past debts? The state procurement order should be at one and the same level for all regions. The adoption of such a law would be premature.

At 1857 GMT Deputy Lutsans says that the Baltic republics are not afraid of the price of coal being raised. Many deputies have talked about observance of the Constitution. But the Constitution says that republics all have sovereignty and sovereignty implies economic independence.

At 1903 GMT Deputy Brazauskas says that the Baltic republics are ready for financial autonomy. Yes, the Supreme Soviet is discussing unconventional matters. But a light has appeared—let us not extinguish it. The issue of subordination has been raised. The Baltic republics are also concerned about the issue of subordination of industry. Brazauskas states, however, they consider it natural for industrial enterprises to exist of their own right. We would ask the Supreme Soviet to be most serious in its consideration of the proposed law. Brazauskas proposes amendments to allow enterprises to enter into interrepublican associations. Brazauskas asks the deputies to vote for the draft law.

At 1910 GMT an unidentified speaker asks about the level of sovereignty to be given to the Baltic republics. Lukyanov says that this is a theoretical issue and the session will not examine it.

At 1912 GMT Deputy (?Ogetyan) says that there must be trust between the republics if there is to be success for the whole country. We want to live in the same way as the rest of the world. The Lithuanian and Estonian colleagues are proposing to advance the economy. Having visited Lithuania frequently, the deputy says that an exceptional atmosphere of internationalism exists there. The love for labor must be restored. Lithuania and Estonia will make the first step.

At 1916 GMT an unidentified speaker proposes passing the law at the first reading. This will give the republics a chance to proceed and work out the formalities later.

At 1917 GMT Lukyanov expressed gratitude to the previous speaker for her remarks. He and Gorbachev have met Baltic representatives today. Two draft documents are proposed. The first says that the three Baltic republics' proposals for republican financial autonomy from 1990 should be satisfied; that the councils of ministers of the Baltic republics should prepare for the transition; that USSR laws should act in the Baltic republics insofar as they do not contradict the transition to financial autonomy there. The second draft document says that the main proposals concerning financial autonomy for the Baltics should be passed at the first reading; Primakov, Maslyukov, Abalkin, Alekseyev, and representatives of other commissions and committees should prepare a draft law, finalizing financial autonomy for the Baltic republics.

Lukyanov asks if the deputies accept the proposals.

At 1925 GMT an unidentified speaker proposes returning the issue to a commission.

At 1926 GMT Lukyanov says that the first reading has already, in effect, taken place. There is good sense in adopting a draft law which will give the green light to financial autonomy. The rest can be ironed out later during a second reading. An expedient solution has been reached in agreement with the comrades from the Baltic republics. It should be passed.

At 1928 GMT an unidentified speaker makes further proposals, suggesting that union laws operate in the Baltic republics if they do not contradict the principles of republican financial autonomy.

At 1932 GMT a further unidentified speaker suggests delaying the matter until tomorrow morning. Lukyanov asks that the business be finished today.

At 1933 GMT an unidentified woman asks why the original draft law cannot be passed in the form which it was forwarded from the committees and commissions. there must be a firm legal footing for republican financial autonomy to be introduced in the Baltic republics in 1990.

At 1935 GMT another unidentified speaker asks how the USSR Supreme Soviet can adopt a law relating only to some individual republics.

At 1936 GMT one more unidentified male speaker says that republican financial autonomy is not really financial autonomy. He claims to be an expert on the subject. He says that the draft law is based on the principles of

yesteryear. He proposes that the Supreme Soviet committees should examine the proposals of the deputies and bring the draft law in later for a second reading.

At 1939 GMT an unidentified speaker says that there are two options; either to adopt the draft law as it is or to convene the congress of people's deputies to change the Constitution so that the draft law can be passed.

At 1941 GMT Lukyanov says that the republics have invested concepts that are much deeper in their proposals for financial autonomy. The draft law will be discussed and voted on tomorrow. However, the issue of republican financial autonomy for the Baltic republics from 1990 must be seen as having been resolved tonight.

At 1944 GMT an unidentified deputy reads out a constituent's letter.

At 1945 GMT Deputy Pavliy talks about pension rights and calls for action.

At 1947 GMT Deputy Sazonov talks about the rights of families with many small children.

At 1950 GMT Lukyanov names venue and time for work of committees and commissions.

At 1951 GMT Lukyanov declares the meeting over.

Resolution on Supreme Soviet Bodies' Tasks
PM2807082189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 Jul 89 Second Edition pp 1, 2

["USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution 'On the Organization of Work To Fulfill the Instructions Given to the USSR Supreme Soviet by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies'"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To commit itself to rigorous implementation of instructions given by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet, its committees, the chambers' permanent commissions, and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

2. To recognize the need for the USSR Council of Ministers to prepare the following draft USSR laws on a priority basis and to submit them for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet:

on property in the USSR;
on land and land utilization;
on leasing and lease contract relations;
on a uniform tax system in the USSR;
on the introduction of amendments and additions to the USSR Laws "On the State Enterprise (Association)" and "On the Cooperative Movement in the USSR;"
on the socialist enterprise;
on general principles for leadership of the economy and social sphere in union republics;
on general principles of local self-management and local economy in the USSR;
on the procedure for the resolution of collective labor disputes;
on trade unions in the USSR;
on increasing the pensions of low-income category pensioners as of 1 October 1989.

3. When examining questions concerning the country's economic and social development, the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, the USSR Supreme Soviet committees, the chambers' permanent commissions, and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium must be strictly guided by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies directives on the need to do everything to ensure priority for questions concerning the social sphere—raising working people's living standards and developing health care services, culture, and public education.

The USSR Council of Ministers is instructed to prepare a draft USSR Law on Pension Provision and to submit it to the USSR Supreme Soviet in October 1989.

4. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium is instructed to prepare, jointly with the relevant USSR Supreme Soviet committees and chambers' permanent commissions, and to submit for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet:

a draft USSR Law on Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Fundamental Law) concerning questions of the electoral system and other most substantial questions of social development;

draft Procedural Regulations for the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet;

draft USSR laws:

on the status of people's deputies in the USSR;
on mandates by voters and public organizations;
on the procedure for recalling USSR people's deputies;
on support for the activity of USSR people's deputies and reimbursement of expenses incurred by them in connection with their activity as deputies.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of the Work of Soviets of People's Deputies and of the Development of Management and Self-Management, jointly with other USSR Supreme Soviet committees and chambers' permanent commissions, must prepare and submit for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet's second session proposals on the procedure for the annual renewal of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and draft regulations for the USSR Supreme Soviet committees and the chambers' permanent commissions.

5. The USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities must study and submit proposals on the question of clearer delineation of the powers of the USSR and the

union republics, proceeding from the premise that union republics autonomously exercise state power in their territories and decide all questions which are not within the USSR's jurisdiction, as well as proposals associated with questions raised at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and concerning the status of autonomous republics and autonomous oblasts and okrugs, the restitution of the rights of Volga Germans, Crimean Tatars, and Meskhetian Turks, and the development of other smaller peoples in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations must examine the state of affairs in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and must submit its proposals on this question by 1 October 1989.

6. The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform Questions, jointly with the relevant chambers' commissions and with participation by union republic representatives, must examine the republics' proposals on questions of expanding their economic autonomy, as well as the proposals submitted in the form of legislative initiatives by the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and Estonian SSR Supreme Soviets on the transition of these republics to economic accountability starting in 1990. Conclusions on these proposals are to be submitted for examination by the current USSR Supreme Soviet session.

Similar proposals by other union republics are to be examined as and when they are received.

7. When discussing the draft plan and budget for 1990, the Soviet of the Union Planning, Budget, and Financial Commission and the other chambers' permanent commissions and USSR Supreme Soviet committees must proceed from the Congress of USSR People's Deputies directives on restoring the national economy to health, sharply reducing the budget deficit, imposing order in money circulation, and satisfying consumer market needs for goods and services, and also from the proposals on stabilizing the country's economic position made by people's deputies.

8. The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Agrarian Questions and Food, taking into account the address by a group of agrarian deputies to the Congress, must place the main emphasis in its work on the resolution of fundamental tasks concerning the enhancement of the efficiency of agriculture, the social reorganization of the countryside, the boosting of the prestige of peasants' labor, and the ensuring of equivalence in exchanges between agriculture and industry.

9. The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order must:

adopt measures to accelerate the preparation of draft USSR laws aimed at the implementation of judicial and legal reform, and primarily laws ensuring the courts' independence and high standing in Soviet society;

organize the working out of questions associated with the stepping up of human rights protection, the improvement of labor legislation, the expansion of judicial protection of Soviet citizens' rights, and appeals to the courts against unlawful actions by officials and state organs;

participate in the elaboration of measures aimed at strengthening discipline and responsibility, stepping up guarantees of citizens' safety from infringements against their lives, health, honor, and property, eliminating shortcomings in the work of law enforcement organs in the struggle against corruption, organized crime, embezzlement, and bribery, boosting and consolidating the material and technical backup of courts, prosecutor's office organs, arbitration service, investigative organs, and the militia, and improving living conditions for their staffers;

submit to the USSR Supreme Soviet its conclusions on the extent to which normative acts on the procedure for organizing and holding rallies and demonstrations and on the duties and rights of USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops conform with the USSR Constitution.

10. The USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee must elaborate proposals on the examination of the most important foreign policy questions by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet and on the procedure for ratification and renunciation of international treaties signed by the USSR, and must also produce a political evaluation of the decision made in the past to introduce Soviet troops in Afghanistan and submit its conclusion to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

11. The USSR Supreme Soviet committees, the chambers' permanent commissions, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and other state organs accountable to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet must analyze and sum up the specific proposals made by deputies at the congress and take them into account in draft legislation work, the conduct of monitoring activity, the improvement of work with citizens' letters and applications, and the examination and preparation of other questions falling within their jurisdiction.

12. The USSR Council of Ministers must elaborate a plan of measures for the implementation of the congress resolution "On Basic Guidelines for USSR Domestic and Foreign Policy" and must submit it to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Moscow, The Kremlin, 24 July 1989.

Correction to Confirmation of Armed Forces Cuts

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Armed Forces Reductions Confirmed," published in the 27 July Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 35, second column:

the sourceline should read: LD2707095289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 27 Jul 89. (correcting source)

Mine Strikes Situation, Negotiations Updated

Vorkuta Miners 'Suspend' Strike

PM2807090589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by own correspondent V. Filippov: "Strike Suspended"]

[Text] Vorkuta—In view of the fact that the Council of Ministers had partially met the Vorkuta and Inta miners' demands and people's deputy V.P. Lushnikov had conveyed the whole package of demands to the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Vorkuta City strike committee recommended suspension of the strike. All 13 mines in the "Vorkutaugol" Association are back at work. Before midday on 27 July, some of them—the "Vorkutinskaya" mine, for example—had fulfilled the daily coal shipment plan. The miners of the Arctic are endeavoring to make up for the losses caused by the strike. During it 252,453 tonnes of coal and 48,785 tonnes of concentrate for metallurgical enterprises were lost.

But the situation in the city cannot be described as stable. The strike committee has reserved the right to resume the strike 8 days after its suspension (that is, 3 August) unless all the demands are met. But there are many political demands among them. In particular, the miners are demanding the election of new leaders of Vorkuta City Party Committee, City Soviet Executive Committee, and the territorial committee of the Coal Industry Workers' Union.

Vorkuta Miners Increase Production

LD2707171189 Moscow TASS in English 1647 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Vorkuta, Komi Autonomous Republic July 27 TASS—Vorkuta miners in northern Russia are increasing coal production.

Whereas on Wednesday [26 July], the first day of work after the strike, they supplied 35,000 tonnes of coal, filling 572 goods wagons, or nearly half of the planned quota for the day, on Thursday another 500 or so wagons were loaded with coal just during the night.

Miners hope that government action on demands by miners in the Pechora coal basin will expedite the resolution of pressing social problems. They intend to work hard and make up for the losses inflicted by the stoppage.

The economic damage done is great, including a production shortfall of more than 300,000 tonnes of coal, over two kilometres of tunnels and 60,000 tonnes of concentrate.

The regional Vorkutaugol mining administration's losses amounted to more than ten million rubles. As a result, contributions to the miners' incentive fund decreased by about a quarter of the sum.

Donetsk Strike Committee Members Cited

LD2707233189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [G. Kondaurov] Today all the mines in the Donesk Oblast are working, and, in the course of today, much more coal has been extracted than yesterday. But the miners still have not reached the 24-hour plan target. [video shows mine elevators working and railcars at a mine] The strike committees are continuing to work at their enterprises. Their representatives are participating in elaborating government and legislative acts about the fulfillment of the protocols signed by the government commission and the strikers. But they have a particularly large number of local matters—at the level of an enterprise or a mine, of a city or settlement. The miners patience is rapidly wearing thin: You will not achieve anything new; the time schedules have not worked out. The monthly soap allocation is so small that there is nothing to wash yourself with after work and the coalface. Automated and electronic devices have been put into place, but the large staff of timekeepers has not been reduced. The strike committee of the Abakumov mine occupied the party committee building and not just because there are spare premises here, but because they are acting, essentially, in a single front. The party committee secretary—Sergey Aleksayevich Kamyshev—is a member of the strike committee. [video shows strike committee meeting in process]

[Begin recording] [Kamyshev] We spoke directly with the Communists. During a night-time meeting, we assembled the Communists and asked: What do you think? Should the Communists support the strike? Or should they not? And the vast majority of Communists replied that we must support the strike because we are all miners and the demands of all the miners are also the demands of Communist miners.

[Second man] I will say, for example, that the party has not lost the trust of the people, because I can show this from my own case. I am the party organizer of a section and I was nominated immediately among the first members of the strike committee.

[Third man] I used not to be a supporter of the Communists. I can even say that openly. I got involved in such rows with them that I cannot even describe. But now I have begun to understand them more. And I think that they have come to understand me more as an ordinary Soviet person. [end recording]

[Kondaurov] The miners have expressed no confidence in some party officials. And plenary meetings of party committees, in the work of which representatives of the strike committees will take part, will draw conclusions from this severe criticism.

Voronin Holds Talks With Miners

LD2707162889 Moscow TASS in English 1459 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 27 TASS—Soviet First Deputy Prime Minister Lev Voronin had a constructive meeting here today with representatives of miners from three Ukrainian cities.

The delegates from Stakhanov, Kirovsk and Krasnodon told him about problems worrying their worker collectives and generating social tension.

Voronin, for his part, briefed them on efforts by the government and the coal mining ministry to remove production and social issues that have piled up.

Further on Ryzhkov Meeting With Miners

PM2507144589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jul 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "N.I. Ryzhkov's Meeting With Donbass Miners' Representatives"; for other reportage of this meeting, see page 65 of the 26 July Soviet Union DAILY REPORT]

[Text] A meeting was held today in the Kremlin between Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and representatives of Donbass strike committees.

The miners talked about the acute situation which has taken shape in the coal basin, and set out the demands of the labor collectives. Social and economic problems which worry miners most were discussed, first and foremost the improvement of work and everyday and rest conditions; pension provisions; increased pay; the offer to miners, in accordance with the USSR Law on State Enterprises (Associations) of full economic and legal independence; and the adjustment of their mutual relations, not only with higher economic but also local soviet bodies. The miners expressed serious grievances against them connected with bad management and bureaucracy in resolving vitally important questions, and an inattentive attitude toward people's needs. The miners' demands arising out of all this are laid out in a protocol on agreed measures between the miners' strike committee, the USSR Council of Ministers Commission, and the All-Union Central Council Of Trade Unions.

During the discussion of the problems raised by the miners, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov noted that in connection with the miners' strikes an extremely tense situation has arisen, which is creating great difficulties for the national economy. At the same time the miners' demands are to a great extent well-founded, and it is essential to resolve the problems which have accumulated in the most urgent fashion.

A concrete program of action relating to the whole of the country's coal industry was worked out at the meeting. Protocols of agreement between government commissions and miners of the country's coal basins have been adopted for execution.

Taking into account the fact that the meeting reached mutually-acceptable solutions, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov called on the miners of Donbass and other coal basins to halt the strike and to return to their places of work.

Taking part in the meeting were: Comrade Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Minsiters; Korkin, first deputy minister of the USSR coal industry; and USSR people's deputies Boyko and Saunin.

Coal Miner Union Leader Interviewed

AU2707184589 Hamburg STERN in German 27 Jul 89 pp 116-117

[Interview with Valentin Medvedev, deputy chairman of the Soviet coal miners' union, by Peter Bier; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] [Bier] Valentin Ivanovich, did you ever strike when you were a miner?

[Medvedev] No, it never came to that in my case. We protested occasionally. That was enough. However, ever since I have been a union official, I know what being criticized by the workers means. Their demands are reasonable and fair. And you know very well that all this cannot be fulfilled overnight or just by way of a decision. Then the workers say: That is enough now! Then you must have a lot of ideas to relax the situation, either by talking to them, or by giving in.

[Bier] The chairman of the trade union top organization, Shalayev, together with Politburo and government members, has negotiated with workers in Siberia. Does that mean that the trade union does not represent the strikers' interests?

[Medvedev] Comrade Shalayev and our chairman, Mikhail Srebniy, have publicly declared their solidarity with the strikers' demands. The problems that are being

discussed are known to everybody. They have existed for quite some time. However, the solution is complicated, because all types of local, state, and trade union levels are responsible.

[Bier] Strikes have been infrequent in the Soviet Union. They have often been smashed by the militia or the Army....

[Medvedev] ... but not miners' strikes. Nor is there a reason to do so. What is going on there is not a political struggle, but an economic and social one. Granted, the abolition of privileges for officials may be policy for some people. In my view, it is economics. It is the distribution of goods and services. There must be no special privileges any more in this respect.

[Bier] How about the demand to finally turn the mines into independent enterprises, and free them of bureaucratic tutelage?

[Medvedev] Viewed from your angle, this is certainly policy. For the miners, things look differently. When a mine works independently, a miner sees it in his purse. More profits for the enterprise means more and better nursery schools, schools, hospitals, and shops. Some representatives of so-called informal groups have tried to turn this strike into a political conflict. And what happened? The miners ousted these people without much ado. Their subject is the economy, their wages, and shift work, annual leave, social guarantees, old-age pensions, and....

[Bier] ... and the supply of foodstuffs and consumer goods.

[Medvedev] If you like, it is a political problem, because it can only be resolved politically. Once the deficits have been overcome, the rest would be nothing. However, our people understand that the supply cannot be improved overnight or by way of decision. They are not dreamers.

[Bier] It surely must have been clear to you what annoyance accumulated in the coal mines. After all, every worker also is a trade union member. Why did you keep quiet so long?

[Medvedev] We knew what mood the miners were in. Since 1 January 1989, the economic reform has been in force which is supposed to free the enterprises of total planning and control by the ministries, and forces them to adopt economic cost accounting and self-financing. The transition led to frictions: Those who are "below" think that things do not go fast enough and do not reach far enough; those who are "above" do not want to give away everything. Everybody has felt the consequences. First, the wages dropped. An additional annoyance was that those who had property, were self-employed, had concluded lease contracts, or worked in a cooperative, profited from the economic reform and earned a lot of money. However, the miners, who traditionally were at the top of the wage scale because of their hard and difficult work, were suddenly taken over by many others, and felt they had been passed over.

[Bier] Why did you let things get that far?

[Medvedev] We said that the law on state enterprises does not work. The promise to pay a night shift differential of 40 percent has not been fulfilled. And so forth. We passed this on to the ministry with a list of demands.

[Bier] What happened?

[Medvedev] That was 1 month ago in the ministry. The miners found that it just did not go fast enough. They prepared for a strike.

[Bier] Was the impatience not understandable? If it takes such a long time, something must be wrong with the connection between Moscow and the mines.

[Medvedev] That was also said by our newspapers. They reproached us for not representing the miners' interests, but having concentrated on coordinating everything carefully—with the party, with the ministry, and with the government. They said that we should finally become independent. Do you know who made these reproaches?—Mikhail Gorbachev. He is right. These constant consultations have always hindered developments. The strike has shown it to everybody. We will now stop this.

[Bier] Will such strikes now be part of Soviet routine?

[Medvedev] I do not wish anybody such militant measures. Strikes are unpleasant for all concerned. At any rate, we will do everything to avoid them. However, in this case we have backed the strike, not only by words, but also by deeds. Therefore, we have supplied the strikers with food. I cannot and will not guarantee that there will be no more strikes. Nor do we have to be afraid of strikes. However, we urgently need a law that guarantees the right to strike, if we want to change the Soviet Union into a state ruled by the law.

Strikes Due to 'Half-Hearted' Reforms

PM2707160389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 89 Second Edition p 2

[Miroslav Buzhkevich "Political Diary": "Act!"]

[Text] Have you noticed how time is now being compressed, absorbing many events. There are now more events in a day than in a month or even a year in the old, stagnant times. That is why life is becoming more dynamic and more complex. That is why actions and active quests for the requisite solutions are valued especially now.

The Congress of USSR People's Deputies decided to raise the minimum pension level for workers, employees, collective farm workers, and first and second group invalids to R60-R80 as of 1 January 1990. The central organs received requests to speed up the solution of this problem and introduce the new procedure as of 1 October this year. Some R1.5 billion will be needed for this. The quest has started. People's deputies proposed using some party subscriptions for these needs. This was approved by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo—the pension fund will receive R500 million. The All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] will donate approximately R700 million of trade union subscriptions. Lastly, the Soviet Peace Fund has allocated R50 million. The remaining R250 million will indisputably be found. This is a specific action—a real factor in perestroyka.

We have all followed in alarm the course of the strikes in the coal industry, which began with the Kuzbass miners' demonstrations and encompassed virtually the entire sector. M.S. Gorbachev assessed the event as our gravest ordeal in the entire 4 years of perestroyka.

Some people saw the strikers' demands above all as motivated by dissatisfaction at the shortage of food and industrial goods. The question does in fact go considerably deeper. People did not stop work for a piece of meat or sausage. They were brought out onto the streets by a lack of social justice and alarm at perestroyka and the half-hearted and incomplete nature of the planned reforms. This was a workers' protest against the administrative-edict bureaucratic system, which still possesses real force. An enforced protest—in an extremely undesirable form that bodes dire consequences.

We know how events developed. Government commissions were set up and dialogue began with the miners and ended with the elaboration of miners' specific demands and their acceptance for examination by various bodies—ranging from local to central organs. Once again the center had the most important say. It is planned to resolve the question of economic and juridical independence for enterprises in the Kuzbass and the whole sector by 1 January next year. The Ministry of the Coal Industry has been tasked with introducing, by the same date and by way of an experiment, a new tax system that corresponds to enterprises' interests to a greater degree. How many intimations did the Ministry of the Coal Industry receive about the need to pay miners more for evening and nighttime shifts! Now that things have heated up, everything has changed all of a sudden. Questions relating to this remuneration and to a common day off along with a number of others are to be resolved by 1 August.

The question inevitably arises: Why, until the "upper echelons" intervened, were people's just demands not attended to or simply ostentatiously ignored and hushed up? Nothing was done until, as they say, people's hands were forced. In the opinion of the people's deputies who discussed the situation in the country at the USSR Supreme Soviet session it is not perestroyka that is under way at many ministries, departments, and local party, soviet, and economic organs but semi-perestroyka, not democratization but semi-democratization. Some local soviets and their apparatus have lost people's confidence. The best confirmation of this is the fact that the miners involved in the strike only acknowledged M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov as guarantors of the fulfillment of their demands. The word of other leaders of the Ministry of the Coal Industry, oblast party committees, oblast soviet executive committees, rayon party committees, and rayon soviet executive committees were empty phrases for the miners which had become worthless.

That is also the result of inactivity on the part of such leaders who were blinded by their faith in the omnipotence of administrative edicts. It is hard, if not completely impossible, for them to renounce their old habits and traditions. The time will not forgive this; events have swept them away from the paths of perestroyka.

Our main weapon today is concrete actions in the interests of people, constant contact with them, knowledge, and understanding of their troubles and needs. Just as the gleaming indicators and instruments on a pilot's instrument panel indicate the "health" of the machine, so concrete actions—prompt actions geared to the future healing people's concerns and troubles—on the part of local and central organs attest to the health of society. We must all act to safeguard it. Today, tomorrow, and always!

Further Reportage on Abkhaziya Situation

Patrol Kills Sniper in Sukhumi

LD2707193989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Our special correspondent Leonid Lazarevich reports from Sukhumi:

[Lazerevich] During the day Sukhumi is an ordinary resort town, but at night one sleeps there very lightly. Shots, bursts of submachine gun fire woke us up, and in the morning we rushed to one of the military posts. We found out that for the first time in Abkhaziya the internal troops had been forced to use weapons. Listen to a recording we made.

[Begin recording] [Lazarevich] During the night a shot hit the flak jacket of (Konstantin Velinskiy), a cadet of the Novosibirsk school of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. (Konstantin), how did all this happen?

[(Velinskiy)] I was on duty, maintaining public order. Getting out of the bus, I saw a flash and heard the thump of some shot on my flak jacket. I shouted that shots were being fired and I heard a second burst. Well, I managed to get behind a bus.

[Lazarevich] How old are you?

[(Velinskiy)] Twenty-eight.

[Lazarevich] Captain (Zvetkov), who was in command of this patrol, continues the conversation. How did the arrest take place? From what distance was the criminal firing?

[(Zvetkov)] The criminal was firing from a distance of about 30 to 40 meters from the bridge, taking advantage of natural cover. We could only determine where he was from the burst, from the second burst. At one moment it was fired at the bus, at Cadet (Velinskiy) the next. After the second shot he ran about 15 meters, when we arrested him.

[Lazarevich] Then an hour later a second attack was carried out on your post, on your patrol, is that right?

[(Zvetkov)] Yes. After approximately that amount of time, the second attack occurred. During that one, the criminal taking advantage of the cover was able unfortunately to approach too closely to our.... [trails off]

[Lazarevich] How many meters was it?

[(Zvetkov)] It was 15, perhaps 20, when we noticed him moving along in the dark, noticed that he was armed. He did not even react to a warning shot. He more or less immediately started firing. It was ten meters probably.

[Lazarevich] How many times did you fire a warning shot?

[(Zvetkov)] Three times. Three times, but with quite a small interval, again hailing him. On the given occasion he was firing after all. He was able apparently either to reload his weapon...that is we were not able in this situation, at this short range, to choose that tactic that we used on the first occasion.

[Lazarevich] And you were obliged to fire.

[(Zvetkov)] Yes, unfortunately, it was necessary to fire. I gave the command and the cadets fired not to hit, that is not to kill, but to disable, strictly at his legs. We immediately carried him into our bus, undressed him. It was possible.... A transfusion of blood was necessary of a different type than any of the 11 men in our patrol and we took him away. But, unfortunately, he became worse. A bullet had hit him in the stomach. For that reason, he died on the way. [end recording]

[Lazarevich] Day and night in Abkhaziya differ as night from day. And here there are two diametrically opposed forces: one is committed to a peaceful, calm life; and the other to heightening the tension.

Sniping at Gulripsha Traffic Control Post

LD2707231289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [P. Guskov, correspondent] How fine it is today on the beaches of Abkhaziya, which are bathed in sunshine! It is pleasant to stroll around the shops and to look at ancient monuments. In short, everything is as it was in the good old days.

But there is another life, too. The press center of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs reported today that 218 firearms have been confiscated since the start of the tragic events, including 133 rifles and combat guns. [video shows general beach and street scenes; several rifles laid out on a table in a room, where the correspondent stands talking to another man]

[Begin recording] [Z.N. Ankvab, chief of Gudauta rayon militia section] Two days ago there was a meeting of the party aktiv, at which the Communists of the rayon and the aktiv called on the population to be more energetic in handing in seized weapons. As a result 24 out of 62 seized weapons have been handed in by the population over 2-3 days.

[Guskov] I see you have various weapons lying here.

[Ankvab] Perfectly correct. Four assault rifles, two machine guns, pistols....

[Guskov, interrupting] TT pistols? [Expansion unknown]

[Ankvab] Of the TT system; carbines, smallbore rifles, and other types of weapons have been returned. [end recording] [video shows Ankvab displaying an example of each type as he names it]

[Guskov] It is always harder to correct the faults of others—and these weapons were seized, in the main, from staff of the militarized railway guard—and all the harder when the number of irresponsible, instigatory statements are put about, statements which not only offend individual officials of party and local soviet bodies, but also offend national feelings. And what is alarming is that these appeals are also coming from the pages of printed publications and are being heard on the air. Trust, which is weak and only just arising again, collapses once more.

A traffic control post in Gulripsha rayon was fired on last night; the man who fired the shots was detained. But less than an hour later shots were again fired on the patrol—on these lads. Captain Grigoriy Vladimirovich Shuvachko and a cadet standing beside him were saved by their bullet-proof vests. Why did they not fire back immediately? Army rules do not allow them to; they acted according to instructions—first they ordered halt, and fired warning shots, and only then did they open fire

in reply. The attacker—who, incidentally, was not sober—died. But it is necessary to finally realize that this is not the time to run about late at night, especially not carrying weapons. The times are troubled and stern. [video shows a group of six soldiers and the man apparently identified as their captain standing against an outside wall]

Weapons, Explosives Confiscated

PM2707141589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 89 Second Edition p 6

[Special correspondent V. Chertkov dispatch: "Too Early To Tell. On Events in Abkhaziya"]

[Text] Abkhaz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR], 26 Jul—Following the long spell of bad weather, the sun has finally broken through the low-lying rain clouds over Sukhumi and the grayness has disappeared, but the all-union resort has not become any livelier.

On the surface things are calm here. But let us look at the information provided by the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD]. The normalization of the situation is indicated by the fact that people have started voluntarily handing in firearms to the militia organs. A total of 146 hunting rifles, 22 rifles, 2 pistols, an assault rifle, and 20 kg of explosives have been confiscated or voluntarily handed in during the last 24 hours.

A special regime for citizens' conduct remains in force on Abkhaz ASSR territory, and in the last 24 hours 23 persons have been detained for breaching it.

In Sukhumi citizen M. Pirveli reported to the Sukhumi City Internal Affairs Department that unknown persons opened fire on the motor vehicle belonging to him. An investigation is under way. G. Sanaya, chairman of the Gali Hunters' Society, reported to Galskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department: Unidentified criminals broke into a store where they stole cartridges, gunpowder, and shot. Measures are being taken to establish the criminals' identity.

The situation in the autonomous republic remains alarming. Staffers of Akhaltsikhskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department detained several suspects who entered the office of A. Khvedelidze, director of Akhaltsikhe's cheese and butter plant, and demanded R10,000 from him. Following their detention, two hunting rifles with cartridges and two hunting knives were confiscated from their motor vehicle.

The Georgian SSR MVD declares: The law-enforcement organs have sufficient manpower and facilities to impose order in the republic and to protect citizens from unlawful encroachments. There is no reason to believe rumors that hundreds of people supposedly died during the events in Abkhaziya. It has already been reported that only 18 people have died and 294 have suffered injuries. As of today 70 people—1 of whom is in a serious condition—are undergoing hospital treatment. Here is what Yu. Reshetin, leader of the USSR MVD Press Center in Abkhaziya, announced:

"During the last 24 hours the situation in the autonomous republic has remained tense. An unidentified criminal threw an explosive device into the garage yard of the Abkhaz Oblast Resorts Council Installation and Construction Administration in Krasnoarmeyskaya Street. The explosion damaged a Kamaz motor vehicle. That same evening unidentified persons threw an explosive device into a house on Kazbegi Street while the owners were absent. The explosion broke the windows. There were no casualties in either case."

Most industrial enterprises in Sukhumi were operating, as were almost all stores and public catering and consumer services enterprises. Twenty trains departed from the railway station—11 freight trains, 4 passenger trains, 2 mail and baggage trains, and 3 electric commuter trains. A total of 1,829 air passengers departed on 40 flights, and 134 people departed by sea.

Sukhumi Official Cited

PM2707095789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Unnamed TASS correspondent report: "Situation in Abkhaziya"]

[Text] Sukhumi, 26 Jul—The resort city which has lived through alarming days is acquiring its usual appearance. On the once quiet streets there are once again many motor vehicles, buses, and trolleybuses running, and vacationers are to be encountered. The first smiles are on faces which only recently were still gloomy. The highly charged sociopolitical situation in Abkhaziya is gradually being defused. You have the impression that the national mourning declared in the republic has sobered up the hotheads.

The majority of industrial enterprises and the stores are functioning in the city and consumer services are operating. The local railroad department is working intensively—yesterday 20 trains were dispatched from the station.

The time for a serious test—of people's trust—has come for the republic's party and soviet organs today. A test on which the results of finding compromise solutions largely depend.

"It is clear that in the situation which has taken shape the compromised administrative-edict methods are quite inapplicable," we were told by A. Chkadua, secretary of the "Abkhazstroy" trust party committee. "With a view to the speediest restoration of a normal working rhythm at the trust's establishments we have created an admittedly small but monolithic group of people of Abkhaz and Georgian nationalities, those people who have not lost the ability to make a self-critical analysis of the situation and to understand each other. Representatives of the administration and the party committees have

gone to the construction sites and residential microrayons. Work has now been resumed at many construction sites. Constructive dialogue is being set up in which the voices of representatives of both sides who although they do not hold responsible posts enjoy prestige among the population are being heard."

Nonetheless, the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry [MVD] temporary press center reported that the situation remains tense. Last night two explosions thundered out in Sukhumi. In both cases there were no casualties and an investigation is under way. The militia and USSR MVD internal troops servicemen are continuing to confiscate weapons from the population. Thus 128 guns and 50 kg of explosive were voluntarily surrendered or confiscated from the population yesterday.

In all, the internal affairs organs have initiated criminal proceedings in 43 cases and the prosecutor's office in 18 cases for crimes committed during the events which have taken place here.

RSFSR Supreme Soviet 28 Jul Session Reported

LD2807073389 Moscow TASS in English 0700 GMT 28 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 28 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The session of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, the USSR's largest constituent republic, entered its second day as deputies continued to discuss ways of increasing the production and improving the quality of consumer goods. The session is also expected to endorse the decrees of its presidium.

The debate following Russian Prime Minister Aleksandr Vlasov's report on Thursday enabled many deputies to highlight aspects of the economic crisis. Many pointed to the unbalanced market. The current situation leads to social tension in society and negatively affects interethnic relations in the Federation, made up of 16 autonomous republics.

Deputies suggested giving greater autonomy to local governing councils and introducing economic methods of management, designed to stimulate enterprises to increase production of consumer goods. Calls were also made to develop equal economic relations between various regions and union republics. Many deputies said defence industry conversion could be the key to increasing the production of consumer goods.

RSFSR Supreme Soviet 27 Jul Session Reported

Vlasov Delivers Report

LD2707081989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] The 10th session of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet opened in Moscow today [27 July] in the Great Kremlin Palace. In the presidium are Comrades Gorbachev, Vorotnikov, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Chebrikov and Vlasov. The agenda has been confirmed. The following questions have been submitted for discussion: first, on the tasks of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] local soviet and economic bodies in increasing the production and improving the quality of consumer goods in accordance with the directives of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Second, on endorsing the decrees of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Vlasov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, delivered a report on the first question.

Consumer Goods Production Criticized

LD2707142189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] As we have already reported, a session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet began work in Moscow today [27 July]. It is taking place in the Great Kremlin Palace. Our correspondent Olga Vasilenko reports:

[Vasilenko] I will remind you that Russia's deputies are today discussing problems of producing consumer goods. But even without hearing the report by Vlasov, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, all of us, inhabitants of both large and small towns, and the more so of villages, can say that the level of the shortage of these goods has reached the critical mark. But you see in 1986 a republican program was adopted to expand production of these goods, a program calculated to the year 2000. The program is good and it was endorsed by deputies who are working at the session today. So why is it that the situation as regards provision of consumer goods has worsened over 3 years? In just the last half-year period the shortage of goods and services has increased by more than R5 billion, and in my view individual examples make it possible to draw on obvious conclusion: Not ministries but local bodies of power should be masters over their own territory, something which the USSR people's deputies are now saying.

Yes, the Russian deputies admit, the command administrative system is to blame. But why is it that an accusation has been heard not once, not twice in debates, addressed to the USSR people's deputies, to the effect that they have not yet worked out legal guarantees for the work of local soviets, but that they are only insisting on their reelection? The most distressing thing for me, for example, is that the hall applauded these utterances levelled at the USSR people's deputies. Incidentally, a group of people's deputies is getting ready to come to the Russian deputies, and maybe they will be able to find a position, find common interests.

For the time being I have not found for myself any very striking speech from among the Russian deputies about which I would especially like to tell radio listeners.

Another thing: The microphones, arranged for the first time around the meeting hall of the RSFSR session, have not yet been needed. Questions on the course of debate and on the report did not arise, and situations requiring the participation of the (?tellers') commission, which has been created for the first time at the session—also did not arise. So these innovations in the work of the deputies of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet have not yet been needed.

RSFSR Supreme Soviet 26 Jul Session Reported

Session Summarized

LD2607213189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1640 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 26 Jul (TASS)—Issues connected with the holding of the 9th session of the 11th Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet were examined at today's meeting of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. Proposals on the agenda and the procedure of work of the session of the supreme body of state power in the Russian Federation were discussed and approved.

The Presidium discussed the completion of the work of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Commission for Consumer Goods and Services to the Population and the materials prepared for submission to the session. On the instructions of the Commission for Consumer Goods and Services to the Population, a report was delivered by the commission's deputy chairman Vladimir Kapelko.

The meeting was conducted by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Government Changes Announced

LD2607213889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1656 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 26 Jul (TASS)—The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium has carried out a number of changes in the composition of the Republic's government.

Aleksandr Khomyakov has been appointed deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the RSFSR State Planning Committee. He has replaced the retiring Nikolay Maslennikov.

VIktor Zabelin has become minister of construction in the regions of the Urals and Western Siberia of the RSFSR; Vladimir Reshetilov has become minister of construction in northern and western regions of the RSFSR; and Arkadiy Shchepetilnikov has been appointed minister of construction in southern regions of the RSFSR.

Vyacheslav Lebedev has been elected chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Court.

Latvian Supreme Soviet 27 Jul Session Reported

Political, Social Issues Discussed

LD2707135389 Moscow TASS in English 1331 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Riga July 27 Latinform-TASS—The Latvian Supreme Soviet went into session today to discuss a number of political, social, and economic issues, including a republican economic sovereignty plan and a relevant bill.

Latvian prime minister Vilnis Bresis told parliament that the preparation of the bill has been expedited by a debate on similar Lithuanian and Estonian proposals by the national Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

He said that transition to economic independence, to be adopted by Latvia at the beginning of next year, will be made more difficult by either the absence or acute shortage of raw materials and energy resources and by economic disproportions due both to arbitrary dictates by central agencies and to what he called the "infantilism" of local authorities.

Bresis called on deputies to concentrate on finding ways to ensure equivalent exchanges of products and resources between Latvia and other constitutent republics as well as foreign partners.

Economic sovereignty should be built on contractual relations with all Soviet regions and the centre, without any discrimination, which was often in evidence in the past, he said.

The session will also consider amendments to the Latvian constitution, changes to its election system, proposals concerning ecology, and rules of holding public rallies and marches.

Report on Latvian Constitution Given

LD2707213989 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 2000 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Today our republic's Supreme Soviet worked for the first day. We already relayed the whole day; therefore, now we shall only briefly remind you of what was accomplished today.

First of all, the deputies examined organizational questions. By combining two positions Anatolijs Gorbunovs, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, was elected chairman of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet. Imants Daudiss has been elected secretary of the Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Then the deputies turned to the conception of our republic's economic independence. The rapporteur on this question was Vilnis Edvins Bresis, chairman of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers. A extensive debate, the deputies adopted a law on the republic's economic independence

and a USSR law on the economic independence of the Latvian SSR, and also two resolutions which will ensure the coming into force of these two laws.

Today the deputies also listened to a report by Viktors Skudra, Latvian SSR minister of justice, on the alterations and amendments to the Latvian SSR Constitution in connection with the adoption of the republic's sovereignty principles and the law on elections. On this question the co-report was delivered by Professor Andris Plotnieks of the Latvian State University, doctor of juridical sciences. The debate on these reports will take place tomorrow.

Furthermore, the question on the Latvian SSR state sovereignty declaration was postponed until tomorrow. And, as we already said, the session will continue its work tomorrow—you will again be able to follow its process on the radio.

Voting Held for Economic Autonomy

LD2707164289

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1300 GMT on 27 July broadcasts a live relay from today's session of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet session. The session discusses the issue of Latvia's economic independence which was voted on.

At 1345 GMT an unidentified speaker states: "There is a proposal to vote on the law of the Latvian SSR on its economic independence in its entirety. Who is in favor of this? Please raise your voting cards. Let's check now whether everyone is voting. Let's check at the same time how accurately the counting commission is working. Does it add up to 290? We must finish this and then we'll have a break; 288 for, is that right? Against, who is against? No one against. Who has abstained? Again no one. Perhaps, comrade deputies, two persons represent less of an error than 1 percent. Perhaps we'll forgive the counting commission. In principle this is important; if no one has voted against and no one abstained, then this is unanimous."

Proceedings then turn to discussion of the concept of economic independence.

Official Cited on Financial Autonomy

LD2707185889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] [Announcer] I am interrupting the report on the nation's supreme organ of power now to bring you a correspondent's report from Latvia. The republic's Supreme Soviet session began today [27 July] and one of the main questions is the same one that was being decided in Moscow by USSR people's deputies. And so, let us listen to Nenelnishkum:

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] This latest Supreme Soviet Supreme session is to make a very important decision—which I would say is historic in the history of the republic—linked to questions of the fundamental reconstruction of our society. Judge for yourselves: On the agenda are amendments to the constitution concerning the sovereignty of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]; the electoral system, specifically about the formation of the organs of power in the republic and the electoral rights of citizens; the economic independence of the Latvian SSR; the unsatisfactory ecological situation in the republic and ways to improve it; information about the progress of the commission formed by the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR on the political and legal assessments of the Soviet-German pact of 1939; and discussions on the republic's draft law on gatherings, meetings, street processions, and demonstrations.

It is planned that the session will continue its work for 3 days, which is unprecedented for the republic's Supreme Soviet. I do not exclude the possibility of an extension, judging by the problems that are to be discussed and on which it is necessary to make constitutional, legislative decisions. So then, the weight of the problems that have accumulated is heavy. It is necessary to solve them. In the situation that has arisen the path to economic independence and sovereignty is the road of hope, of serious well-founded hope of getting out of the deadlock and the only alternative to the policy of a monopoly on the right to decide, of petty tutelage by union ministries and departments. For example, the Riga confectionery factory had to have the recipes and names of its cookies confirmed by the State Agro-Industrial Committee. I interviewed Vilnis-Edvins Gedertovich Bresis, chairman of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers.

[Bresis] Economic sovereignty for the republic is financial autonomy on a new level. If up to now we have been talking about [financial autonomy on] the enterprise level, we understand financial autonomy for the republic to mean territorial financial autonomy. This is generally directed toward the republic—all the enterprises, the citizens of the republic living as they work and on what they deserve. I would like to say that economic sovereignty and financial autonomy also imply equivalence in exchange, something that we are not of course observing at the moment. It seems to me that this equivalence makes people more interested in greater links between union republics, between the union, and there will be, as it were, an opportunity for us to create real horizontal links with union republics and union ministries, something which we have not been interested in up to now. I think that this is the future for all our republics. [end recording]

Law on Economic Sovereignty Discussed

LD2707235889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] A key issue at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic

[SSR] which opened in Riga today [27 July] is the discussion and adoption of a law and concept devoted to the republic's economic sovereignty.

[Correspondent N. Kasyanova] Interest in the forthcoming decisions is enormous in the republic, where most active public processes and a turbulent political life are in progress. Meetings of Latvia's Interfront and Popular Front were held the day before. So what? The load of accumulated problems is heavy, and they must be solved. Social tension in society is being intensified by the empty market.

In 3 years of the 5-year plan period the monetary income of the republic's population rose by R943 million but the retail trade turnover rose by just R686 million. The imbalance in the market is growing. Cooperatives have not justified the hopes placed in them. Last year cooperatives were given R156 million by the Latvian Republican Bank, but the cooperatives returned only a little more than R11 million.

However, saturation of the market through the activity of cooperatives has not happened. In the situation which has developed, the road of economic independence and sovereignty is the road of hope, of a serious, well-founded hope for a way out of the dead end. This road is the only alternative to the policy of the monopoly right to make decisions and the petty tutelage of Union ministries and departments—when, say, the Riga confectionary works had to get the ingredients the names of its biscuits passed by the country's State Agro-industrial Committee. [video shows outdoor rallies in Riga city center; views of an indoor meeting, presumably the Supreme Soviet in session]

[Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Latvian SSR V.G. Bresis] Economic sovereignty for the republic is financial autonomy on a new level. Whereas up to now we have been talking about the level of enterprises, we understand financial autonomy of the republic to mean territorial financial autonomy—and this is directed mainly towards the republic, all the enterprises and the population of the republic living as they work from what they earn.

I should like to say that economic sovereignty and and financial autonomy also imply equivalence in exchange, something which we are, of course, not observing at the moment. I feel that this equivalence will make people interested in greater ties between Union republics and with the Union; and there will be an opportunity for us to actually create horizontal ties with Union republics and Union ministries, something which, unfortunately, we have not been interested in up to now.

I think that this is the future for all our republics. Without a doubt, I am a supporter of the view that not all are identically ready and that not all are, say, posing this question identically today. And I personally feel that, in the very diversity of our large state, each republic, depending on its economic potential, will choose the form of its own financial autonomy. [video shows Bresis talking to correspondent in a street]

Supreme Soviet Group Goes to Nagorno-Karabakh

Commission Arrives in Stepanakert 20 Jul

NC2707152089 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 25 Jul 89

[ARMENPRES correspondent A. Grigoryan report: "Commission on Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast Commenced Work"]

[Text] Stepanakert, 25 Jul (ARMENPRES)—Members of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission on Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] arrived in Stepanakert on the afternoon of 20 July. In the first group of delegates were Aleksandr Mokanu, deputy chairman of the Council of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet Presidium; Boris Oleynik, deputy chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet and secretary of the Ukrainian Writers Union; Vladimir Foteyev, chairman of USSR Supreme Soviet Commission on Publicity and Citizens' Rights and Appeals; Aleksey Yemelyanov, professor, lecturer at the M.V. Lomonosov State University; Glara Halik, prominent researcher at the Philosophy, Sociology, and Law Institute of the Estonian Academy of Sciences; and Nikolay Sychev, chairman of the Moscow City soviet of the war and labor veterans. The rest of the members will arrive later.

Glara Halik, replied briskly to reporters' questions, saying in particular that the commission has no intention to draw a final conclusion while in NKAO. It is necessary to listen calmly to the people; this is the most important point. The decisions to be made jointly should, to the extent possible, be free from gross mistakes. Glara Halik also said that (?she) intends to question people on a number of issues of interest, though the commission members are more or less are familiar with the NKAO problem. She added that people must be able to evaluate everything with the highest standards; to that extent it is a measure of the value of human life.

During a meeting of the Special Administration Committee the same day they discussed the schedule and procedures for the commission's work.

On the morning of 21 July the members of the commission visited the monument complex for the Karabakhians who were killed during the Second World War and placed flowers near the eternal flame and at the pedestal of the monument. Flowers were also placed at the monument for the Sumgait tragedy and the innocent victims of the earthquake.

At the Nelson Stepanyan public park the guests met party [word indistinct] and labor veterans and listened to their views. The gathering informed the commission

about the aspirations of the Armenian people of Artsakh and unanimously expressed the view that if the autonomous oblast continues to remain within the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] structure, then those aspirations cannot be realized, as history has already convincingly demonstrated. They stressed that the NKAO problem is not a territorial dispute but a national one, arising from the right of national self-determination; and Karabakh people have raised the issue not because of their pleasant life but because of the political, economic, and cultural discrimination pursued by the Azerbaijani leadership for decades towards the oblast and the Armenian section of the population. In conclusion, the veterans expressed the hope that the commission will be able to explore the NKAO situation, would convey to the Supreme Soviet how painful the situation is for NKAO people, and the overwhelming majority's demand for reunification with Soviet Armenia.

In the afternoon, the members of the commission met at the party city committee with Stepanakert's party-economic aktiv.

Activities on 21, 22 Jul Highlighted

NC2707132789 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 25 Jul 89

[ARMENPRES own correspondent A. Grigoryan report: "Commission on Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast Continuing Fact-Finding Mission"]

[Text] As has already been reported, on the afternoon of 21 July the members of the USSR Supreme Soviet commission, who are already in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], held a meeting with Stepanakert's party-economic aktiv. The meeting was opened by Valeri Atajanyan, first secretary of the party city committee and was also addressed by Vladimir Tovmasyan, chairman of the oblast's people's control committee and a member of the NKAO special administration committee; Shimavon Bedrosyan, pensioner; Yervant Bagdasaryan, dean of the Stepanakert branch of Kirovakan pedagogical institute; Rodolf Israelyan, director of No 9 construction firm; Sergey Davityan, chairman of the oblast's trade unions council; Lidia Nesbrava, worker at the footwear factory; Grogor Atanasyan, lecturer at an insitute; Boris Arushanyan, director of the electrical goods factory, and others. They explained the concrete causes for the emergence of the NKAO problem. They underlined in one voice that the fundamental factor behind the Armenian population's discontent was the policy that had been and is being pursued by the Azerbaijani leadership toward the NKAO in the economic, cultural, educational, and health spheres and in the selection and appointment of cadres.

One can describe this policy as a planned violation of the rights and interests of the Armenian autonomous entity. The very existence of such a situation is the result of one of the unforgivable historical errors of the 1920's. However, the most jarring phenomenon is the artificial estrangement of the two parts of the same people and the efforts of certain Azerbaijani historians to prove the unprovable; that is, that the Armenians of NKAO are not Armenians in the first place.

As the speakers pointed out, all this is being done with one aim in mind: to wound the national self-esteem of the overwhelming majority of the oblast's population and thus force them to abandon the lands of their forefathers. A change in the demographic situation will benefit the Azerbaijani side because that will automatically remove the NKAO problem from the agenda. That is why the people's choice as reflected in the 20 February 1988 decision of oblast's soviet, is the only guarantee for the continued existance of the Armenian people in Artsakh [NKAO]. This choice is the reunification of the NKAO with the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR].

The participants in the meeting underlined that the Armenian population of the NKAO has never been disrespectful toward the Azerbaijani people and is ready to live and work side by side with them as equals. The workers of the NKAO favor the resolution of the problem through democratic and constitutional means based on Lenin's principle of national self-determination. This is the requirement of the restructuring and the aspiration of the NKAO's Armenian people which is wholly dedicated to the revolutionary transformation of our society.

On 22 July some members of the commission visited the oblast's children's hospital and conversed with the employees there. The rest of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegates left for Mardakertskiy rayon.

Karabakh 'Problem' Viewed

NC2407102289 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 23 Jul 89

[Text] According to an ARMENPRES report, members of the commission which arrived in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] met with the party and economic aktiv of Stepanakert City. Valeriy Atajanyan, first secretary of the party city committee, opened the meeting. Those addressing the meeting gave concrete proof of the causes for the emergence of the Karabakh problem and underlined that the fundamental factor for the Armenian population's discontent was the policy pursued toward Nagorno-Karabakh by Azerbaijan in all areas of life. They pointed out that the oblast's Armenian population has never assumed a disrespectful attitude towards the Azerbaijani people. NKAO workers support the problem's democratic and constitutional solution, which has Lenin's principle of national self-determination as its foundation.

Some members of the commission familiarized themselves with the oblast's children's hospital yesterday and were briefed by the employees there.

The other members of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation left for Mardakertskiy rayon.

Activities on 24, 25 Jul Outlined

NC2707125589 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Report by ARMENPRES correspondent from Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, NKAO]

[Text] Four more members of the USSR Supreme Soviet commission arrived in Stepanakert on the afternoon of 24 July. Among them was Sergey Manyakin, chairman of the commission and the deputy chairman of the party control committee of the CPSU Central Committee. On the same day the commission met with the workers of the Karabakh silk factory, the largest enterprise in the oblast, where most workers are women. The silk workers were unanimous in the view that the only correct solution of the NKAO problem is the reunification of the oblast with Armenia.

Yesterday, 25 July, a group of delegates left for Shushi where they met the city and rayon party and economic aktiv and creative intellectuals and listened to their views on the NKAO problem, which were no different from the known views of the Azerbaijani leadership. The guests also familarized themselves with the scenic sites of Aroghchavayr city and its environs.

The rest of the commission members continued their work in Stepanakert city, and were briefed on the views of the representatives of the oblast's trade unions council, Leninist Communist Youth Leaque, women and other public organizations on the NKAO problem.

The commission members devote some of their time to private meetings with the population.

'Calm' Over Nagorno-Karabakh Urged

PM2807095389 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 16 Jul 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] At a routine session the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau heard a report from U.S. Arutyunyan, Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] minister of internal affairs, on the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh.

It was pointed out that the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, like the republic's entire public, is extremely concerned at the development of events in the autonomous oblast. It is obvious that the present exacerbation of the situation in the autonomous oblast benefits those who wish to wreck the constructive examination of the problem of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] on a constitutional basis. Under these conditions it is necessary to keep calm and vigilant and to prevent the escalation of passions and the fueling of tension.

The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, the republic's government, local party and soviet organs, and the law-enforcement services are taking effective measures to maintain law and order in the cities and rayons of the Armenian SSR and to ensure the normal functioning of the republic's national economic complex. Corresponding instructions have been issued to party and soviet organs with regard to these questions.

On all questions connected with the situation in the oblast the Armenian SSR's leadership maintains constant contact with the NKAO Special Administration Committee and with central organs.

Note was taken of the fact that the Commission on Nagorno-Karabakh formed by the USSR Supreme Soviet on the instructions of the Congress of People's Deputies will very soon set out for Stepanakert.

Update on Situation in Uzbek's Fergana

PM0607140189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 89 Second Edition p 6

[Report by M. Lurye, chief of a department at the oblast's FERGANSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper: "Events in Fergana Oblast. Month of Expectations and Concerns"]

[Text] Fergana—A new era began for Fergana Oblast's inhabitants 3 June. It was as though their customary life-style had been split into two unequal parts—before and after that date. The curfew introduced 4 June by an Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium decree has been in effect in the oblast for exactly 1 month. At present this enforced measure is still the only reliable guarantee of calm in Fergana.

In the opinion of Colonel General Yu. Shatalin, chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] Internal Troops, despite evident signs of stabilization the situation is still intrinsically tense. This is also confirmed by reports from the oblast commandant, which are published regularly in the local newspapers. From time to time a Meskhetian Turk's abandoned home catches fire and firing at the night patrol can be heard. Menacing rumors are spreading round cities and villages and inflammatory pamphlets terrorizing the local population are appearing. Seeing the futility of strong-arm pressure, the extremists have changed their tactics and are employing every effort to try to prevent the stabilization of the situation, by rousing passions.

The uncontrolled migration from the oblast is growing. According to statistics, there has been a 200-percent increase in comparison with the same period last year. At Fergana and Kokand freight stations the waiting list for containers is full through the end of October.

On the night of 2-3 June a warehouse at Fergana's butter and fats combine burst into flames. According to preliminary data, a wiring fault was the cause of the fire. Definitive conclusions still have to be drawn.

Last month clarified a great deal and forced everyone to think. Most of the people of Fergana condemn the extremists' intrigues and are taking what has happened hard. In their quest for the truth people are organizing rallies and meetings, to which party and soviet employees, law-enforcement officials, political workers, and internal troops are invited for frank discussions.

The investigation into cases of mass lawlessness is continuing. It is being conducted by more than 500 investigators and operations workers who have been sent to the oblast from many regions of the country. According to A. Frolov, assistant USSR prosecutor general, 56 criminal cases are now in the pipeline. Charges of murder, pogroms, robbery, and acts of violence have been brought against 130 suspects.

A great deal has changed in the past month. All industrial enterprises and economic units are working to a tight schedule and school leavers are applying to higher educational establishments. Cultural establishments and movie theaters have resumed their work. The main thing is that the people of Fergana are fully determined to prevent such a tragedy from ever happening on their territory again. Worker formations, self-defense detachments, and people's voluntary militia patrols are being set up everywhere to ensure this. Elders and internationalist soldiers are on duty at farms [makhalli]. In many areas where there used to be a high concentration of Meskhetian Turks the local inhabitants have decided to invite their former neighbors to return to their homes under their collective responsibility. Yu. Kadyrov, deputy chairman of the oblast executive committee, announced that the first four families have already returned to the oblast.

Today the words of M.S. Gorbachev's speech on Central Television are dearer to the people of Fergana than to anyone. They believe that reason will triumph over nationalist ambitions and extremist manifestations.

Sociologist View Reasons for Uzbek Strife

PM0607134989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 89 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with candidate of philosophical sciences G. Shirmatova by own correspondent A. Kaipbergenov: "Sociologists' Opinion. On Events in Fergana Oblast"—date of interview not given, first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] Tashkent—Candidate of Philosophical Sciences G. Shirmatova arrived in Fergana with a group of sociologists at a time when the situation in the oblast was still tense. We agreed that she would tell us about the results of the work carried out by her group. "It can only be a question of preliminary conclusions," Gulsara Shirmatovna warned, "profound and comprehensive research under a special program is yet to be carried out."

[Kaipbergenov] Did the Fergana tragedy come as a surprise to sociologists?

[Shirmatova] We could not have forecast such terrible consequences, of course. But we did know and report to party organs that all was not well in interethnic relations. A number of comprehensive studies carried out by republic scientific institutions had shown that the failure to resolve numerous socioeconomic questions was telling on interethnic relations. A range of potentially explosive problems which had built up during the years of stagnation were exposed and the appropriate proposals for party and soviet officials were compiled.

In general, it is possible to claim today that the main causes of the events were socioeconomic. This is the view of 94 percent of party and soviet officials whom we have questioned. However, it is necessary to distinguish between the causes which create the sociopsychological backdrop of tension conducive to the outbreak of conflict situations, and the root causes which sparked off the actual disturbances.

The first group includes the low living standards of the population, especially the indigenous population. The problems created by monoculture agriculture also have to be mentioned here. In Tashlakskiy Rayon, for instance, where the events were particularly fraught, the share of cotton accounts for 90 percent. Frequently several interrelated families live on 4-6 hundredths of a hectare of land. Low cotton prices in return for considerable expenditure of physical labor, and low wages have always engendered a sense of social dissatisfaction.

More than 80 percent of those questioned regard rising unemployment among young people as one of the main causes. The study has shown that it was particularly young people not engaged in social labor which made up the bulk of the active participants in the events. The number of unemployed in the valley is rising at a rate of 22,500 a year.

[Kaipbergenov] And what were the motives for the events?

[Shirmatova] It is difficult to give a clear-cut answer to this question. Additional in-depth research and an analysis of the investigation organs' conclusions are needed for this. However, it is possible to say right now that there is evidence of various motive forces and a combination of motives and objectives. On the one hand groups formed which were motivated by a desire "to teach the others a lesson," or thirsting for a blood feud, and so forth. After the Kuvasay events there were intensive efforts to spread rumors about "bloody reprisals." Actions aimed at destabilizing the situation were most probably encouraged by people who needed to divert the attention of the law enforcement organs from themselves. The same group which exploited the prevailing situation probably also included people who stood to gain from the disturbances, that is, criminal elements.

On the other hand, there is clear evidence of a kind of mass movement that advocated the solution of the social problems that had accumulated without further delay. This is corroborated by rallies at which demands to eliminate the cotton monoculture, increase purchasing prices, resolve ecological problems, and provide jobs were voiced.

In this case the two aforementioned movements must not be viewed as separate from each other. Unquestionably, the most impatient section of the second group sided with the first group.

[Kaipbergenov] Gulsara Shirmatovna, but why were the criminal actions directed specifically against the Meskhetian Turks?

[Shirmatova] In order to answer this question it is necessary to study with special care the nature of the conflicts which took place in Kuvasay. There were complaints alleging that young Meskhetian Turks had seized all the jobs connected with the organization of leisure activities, that they occupied important positions in the trade sphere and infringed social justice in the distribution of material goods and food products. It is noteworthy that one of the demands that were put forward was the restoration of the party city committee which had previously been abolished. Hopes connected with the implementation of the principles of social justice and the restoration of law and order were pinned to this demand.

Many of the people of Uzbek origin who were polled noted that the Meskhetian Turks are very hard-working and enterprising people. This is the main explanation for the fact that the latter often lived well. It has to be stated that nationalist sentiments in other rayons were often kindled artificially later by means of rumors and faked photographs of "atrocities" and "crimes." Despite all this there are many documented cases of Uzbeks sheltering Turkish families.

[Kaipbergenov] What are your conclusions about the nature of the events that have taken place?

[Shirmatova] According to our polls, 72 percent of those who answered this question believe that the events in the valley were planned in advance. However, investigating this matter, at least three factors which account for the scale and logical interconnection between the tragic events must be borne in mind in our opinion: the tension prevailing in the social atmosphere, the high population density which favors the rapid circulation of rumors, fabrications, and other factors which make passions run high, and the capacity, well known to sociologists, of any group to rally around a single aim or motive and organize itself.

In conclusion it is necessary once again to emphasize that in order to reach definitive conclusions, further comprehensive research and a pooling of efforts of scientists and investigative organs is necessary. We can only explain the causes of the tragedy, nothing can justify the crime.

Zaykov Addresses Moscow Party Meeting

LD2607225689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1523 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 26 Jul (TASS)—Questions relating to the development of intraparty democracy, the perfecting of mutual relations between party bodies and the soviets of people's deputies, and the improvement of ideological work in the conditions of the restructuring of party work were considered at a meeting held today by the Moscow City CPSU Committee [gorkom] and the city's control and auditing commission. The meeting was attended by the first secretaries of the capital's rayon party committee [raykoms] and the chairmen of the control and auditing commissions of rayon party organizations.

A speech delivered by Lev Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the moscow gorkom, pointed out that the process of differentiating party functions from those of the local soviets is proceeding with impermissible slowness, and that the raykoms are paying insufficient attention to it. It is necessary to raise the principled demands, which are tough in true party fashion, that are made of communists entrusted with responsible sections of the work.

As the ruling party, he continued, the CPSU is assessed not only through its direct political activities, but also according to how the material life of Muscovites is organized. Only by actively promoting the solution of the acute social and economic problems will the party committees prove their ability to guide perestroyka and strengthen the working people's belief in the viability of the plans that are being made.

Being the political vanguard, the Moscow gorkom leader stressed, means learning to talk to people, to convince them, and to act resolutely. Success during the forthcoming report-back and election campaign within the party and in the elections to local soviets will be ensured only by vigorous and realistic policies, clear prospects, and an alliance with all the forces that have an interest in the fundamental renewal of socialism.

Zaykov Meeting With Moscow Journalists Lauded

PM0707080389 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 89 p 1

[Own correspondent Sh. Muladzhanov report: "Transcending the Limits of an 'Official Mouthpiece'"]

[Text] Yesterday the secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom [City Committee] had a meeting with journalists in the Moscow Gorkom press center.

"The effectiveness of press articles is the common concern of the editorial staff of newspapers, television, and radio and also of party committees." Those words spoken at the start of the meeting by L.N. Zaykov, Politburo member, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the Moscow party gorkom, in many respects determine the thrust of the conversation. It turned out to be frank and pointed. On both sides. And a characteristic point was this: The dialogue between the leaders of the gorkom and journalists representing central publications and Moscow papers, radio, television, and plant newspapers transcended the usual official limits, going beyond the "question and answer" format.

For instance, when the journalists asked questions concerning the development of the capital's social sphere of the capital, the use of new forms of ideological work, and such "problem" areas of the city as the Arbat or Luzhniki, a sincere exchange of opinions ensued.

The exchange centered on the results of the recent Moscow CPSU Gorkom Plenum. It was noted in particular that there is now a pressing need to check the course of all spheres of work and to analyze progress in implementing the 27th city party conference's decisions. The "Progress-95" program was frequently mentioned in the journalists' questions, the gorkom secretary's answers, and rejoinders from the audience. The problem of mastering political methods of party leadership was actively discussed. Sharing their opinions on these and other questions, L.N. Zaykov, Yu.A. Prokofyev, second secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, and N.M. Andreyanova, V.K. Belyaninov, and Yu.S. Karabasov, secretaries of the party gorkom, often quoted specific facts and speeches by participants in the Moscow CPSU Gorkom plenum, which, according to the general view, took place in the spirit of the times and at a high level of intensity.

Specific problems mentioned at the plenum—the results of the extraordinary party conference at the Moscow State University and the attitude of city authorities to the nuclear reactors operating on the capital's territory, the one at the Kurchatov Institute and the study reactor at the Moscow Engineering and Physics Institute—were also raised. Concerning this matter, it was said that everything necessary will be done to shut down the reactors immediately, without waiting for new bases to be built for them outside the city.

The participants in the meeting also spoke frankly about how to arrange more efficient and modern—in terms of their nature and timeliness—communications between the gorkom, party rayon committees, and the press. There was talk of supplying journalists with fuller information about the activity of party and soviet organs and reaching a new level of political cooperation. This is particularly important in connection with the implementation of the decisions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the upcoming elections to local soviets.

Opinions were also voiced at the meeting about the debate planned by the Moscow CPSU Gorkom plenum on the most important questions of intraparty democracy and of strengthening the CPSU's prestige. Mutual wishes and proposals were expressed.

In short, serious and frank dialogue between the gorkom leadership and the journalists who prepare articles and radio and television broadcasts about the capital's life and problems has begun. It was announced that such meetings will become a regular thing. And a database on all aspects of the city party organization's activity is being set up. These are concrete steps in expanding glasnost in this most important sphere.

Yakovlev Addresses Conference on Foreign Activity

LD2707192189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1818 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jul (TASS)—A conference of secretaries of party organizations of Soviet establishments abroad has taken place in the CPSU Central Committee. Soviet ambassadors in a number of countries and leaders of ministries and departments implementing external links took part in it.

At the center of the conference's attention were the topical tasks of implementing the ideas of new political thinking and improving the activity of Soviet establishments abroad.

Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, addressed the conference participants.

Further on Kazakhstan Personnel Changes

LD2707162689 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1400 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Excerpts] The 13th session of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet's 11th convocation began work in Alma-Ata on 27 July. Taking part in the session are: Comrade Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee; Comrades Bashmakov, Dzhanibekov, (?Kuzimenko), Miroshnik, Sagdiyev, and Tolebekov, members of the bureau of the Communist Party of Kazkahstan Central Committee; Comrades Abdullayev and Gukasov, candidate members of the bureau of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee.

The session was opened by Deputy Medeubekov, chairman of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet. [passage omitted]

The agenda of the session was confirmed on the chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers; on changes in the membership of the Presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet; on the tasks of the republic's soviets of people's deputies in strengthening state and labor discipline in conditions of democratization and glasnost; on

confirmation of the decrees of the Presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet; on changes in the membership of certain standing commissions of the republican Supreme Soviet; on confirmation of the commissions set up by the Presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet.

The session adopted a resolution the release of Comrade Nazarbayev from his duties as chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers in connection with his election as first secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee. Deputy Nazarbayev spoke about the office of the chairman of the republican Council of Ministers. A resolution by the Supreme Soviet on the appointment of Deputy Karamanov as chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers was unanimously adopted. Then Comrade Karamanov, chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers, spoke.

The Supreme Soviet moved on to examine the second matter on the agenda. The floor was given to Deputy Sagdiyev, chairman of the Presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet. In connection with the election of Deputy Kolbin as chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee, a proposal was adopted to release him from his duties as member of the Presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet. The Supreme Soviet unanimously adopted a resolution on the election of Deputy Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Communist of Kazakhstan Central Committee, as member of the Presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet.

A report on the third matter on the agenda was delivered by Deputy Nazarbayev. [passage omitted] The session set up an auditing commission to work out a draft resolution on the matter under discussion. The evening sitting continued discussion of the third matter on the agenda. [passage omitted]

The Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet deputies adopted an appeal to the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in connection with the extremely tense situation that has taken shape in the republic as a result of the systematic failure of the Ministry of Railways to supply sufficient rolling stock.

The 13th session of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet will continue its work tomorrow.

Local Officials Change Jobs

PM2707092389 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 89 p 2

[KAZTAG report: "Oblast Soviet Session"]

[Text] A session of the oblast soviet was held in Tselinograd on 11 July. It examined an organizational question. The session released K.A. Taukenov from his duties as chairman of the oblast executive committee in connection with his election as first secretary of the Kokchetav party oblast committee. K.K. Karbayev, who was first secretary of the Atbasarskiy Rayon party committee, has been elected chairman of the soviet oblast executive committee.

Lithuanians Appeal Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact

LD1707092589 Vilnius in English to North America 2200 GMT 14 Jul 89

[Text] A campaign launched in Vilnius and elsewhere in Lithuania to collect signatures under an appeal to the Governments of the Soviet Union, Federal Germany, and the German Democratic Republic and to the United Nations secretary general was followed by a statement of Lithuania's leadership. The petition being signed by lots of people demands that the aforesaid governments declare the secret protocols of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact legally invalid since the moment they had been signed. It was also demanded that the Soviet Union eliminated the consequences of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, withdrew from the Baltic countries its occupationist army and allowed these nations to determine their own political and social system in Lithuania, Lativa, and Estonia. The United Nations secretary-general is asked to send observers to watch free elections in the Baltic states.

The Lithuanian telegraph agency ELTA has issued a statement made in this connection by the Lithuanian leadership, which favors the pursuit of these goals by constitutional and parliamentarian means. Ambitious demands to withdraw the army from the Baltic states are unacceptable and pose danger to democratic restructuring now under way in this country. The Lithuanian Government will enter into negotiations with the leaders of the Soviet Armed Forces concerning the reduction of the troops in Lithuania. Such steps have been and will be taken in future but the international and domestic context of the Soviet Union should not be ignored. Collecting signatures will only increase political tension both in Lithuania and the Soviet Union in general.

Assessment of Agreement Urged

LD2707171289 Moscow World Service in English 0310 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] The Lithuanian and Estonian parliaments insist there must be a political assessment of the Soviet-German agreements of 1939 and 1940. The notorious deal between Stalin and Hitler, they say, must be fully disclosed if Stalinism is to be rooted out. Now more from Igor Sibirkh, political observer of the Novosti Press Agency. This is what he writes:

In July 1939 an anonymous letter was delivered to the Soviet Embassy in Berlin and quickly dispatched to Moscow. Stalin found the letter so important that he instructed members of the Political Bureau to familiarize themselves with its content. The letter said the German Government would welcome a proposal from the Soviet Government about a direct agreement concerning

Poland and Lithuania. It believed both governments had a natural wish to restore the borders that existed in 1914 and recover lost territories. Stalin knew of Poland's tough stand against any military cooperation with the Soviet Union. He also knew a Lockheed A-12 of the British secret services had landed in Germany to fly out Goering for secret talks with Britain's leaders on 23 August 1939. The situation was critical for the Soviet Union and the experience of the Munich pact gave very serious food for thought. Great Britain and France had already signed the declarations of nonaggression with Germany. The Soviet refusal to sign a similar agreement would give Hitler grounds to declare the Soviet Union was a source of danger and might be the signal to set up an anti-Soviet alliance. All too true, but originally Berlin raised the issue only of reaffirming the German-Soviet netrality treaty of 1926. The two countries could simply have signed a declaration or even a treaty of nonaggression.

On 16 August 1939, when military talks between the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and France were still in progress, the Soviet prime minister, Vyaceslav Molotov, handed the German Ambassador an important note. The note said the conclusion of a nonaggression pact or confirmation of te 1926 treaty was conditional on the simultaneous adoption of a special protocol about both parties' interests concerning certain issues of foreign policy, that the protocol would be an integral part of the pact. The deal was to recognize Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, and Bessarabia as a sphere of Soviet interest. Let me emphasize that the deal spoke of these territories as a sphere of Soviet state interest and not of joint recognition and guarantee of their sovereignty. At the time the wording could only be interpreted as meaning that from then on the destiny of these territories must be determined in Moscow. And events moved in just that direction, but all this has nothing to do with the revolutionary events that took place in the Baltic republics in June 1940, events not staged by Stalin but arising from the social and political crisis. Stalin, however, managed to make these events serve his purposes.

The pact signed on 23 August 1939 can in no way be equated with the Brest peace treaty of 1918. Lenin sacrificed some Soviet territory to save the Soviet republic as a whole. Stalin in turn agreed to connive with the German aggression to recover the territory. For a long time the question wether there were secret protocols to the pact signed by Molotov and Ribbentrop remained unanswered. No trace of the originals could be found either in the Soviet Union or in federal Germany. But a short while ago the prominent Soviet political expert Valentin Falin said there was no reason to doubt their existence. He confirmed that the protocols divided eastern Europe into Soviet and German spheres of influence. Obviously, Stalin and Hitler did reach a deal to divide eastern Europe into spheres of interest.

Further events bear this out. Stalin told Roosevelt in Yalta that if not for the Munich agreement there wouldn't have been the pact of 23 August 1939. Stalin was obsessed with the Munich agreement, which strengthened his distrust of the western democracies. Yet the deal between Stalin and Hitler for the division of spheres of interest differs very little from the Munich deal for the division of Czechoslovakia.

In 1973 the Munich agreement was recognized as being illegal from the very beginning even though it was broken by the occupation of Czechoslovakia and the fall of the Third Reich. It seems to me the Soviet Union should in turn recognize all its deals with Hitler as illegal from the very beginning.

Vilnius Rally Marks 1920 USSR Peace Treaty

LD1407225189 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0000 GMT 13 Jul 89

[Report by Vilnius Radio correspondent Roma Pakeniene]

[Summary] People came to Kalnu park, Vilnius, yesterday to commemorate the anniversary of the 12 July 1920 peace treaty between the Lithuanian Republic and Soviet Russia. The rally was organized by the Union of Lithuanian Independence, which is comprised of the majority of informal political organizations currently existing in Lithuania—Lithuanian League of Liberty; Lithuanian Democratic party; National Youth Union; Union of Christian Democrats; Committee for Saving Political Prisoners; and the Helsinki Group.

Last year's rally was dispersed by the militia. This year about 10,000 people attended. The main idea dominating the speeches was that the 1920 treaty has not been renounced, and therefore it is officially valid.

Egidijus Klumbys, a representative from Sajudis and USSR People's deputy, speaking at the rally, said "I believe that as soon as the USSR recognizes the continuing validity of the 12 July 1920 treaty in relations with Lithuania, all misunderstandings will end. We cannot enter the new Europe, the 21st century, having debts. These debts have to be paid. I believe that the day will soon come when Moscow will recognize that the 12 July 1920 treaty is still valid, and that this is the basis for our relationship."

Resolutions adopted at the rally expressed the same view.

Supreme Soviet Attitudes to Lithuania Assessed

LD0607082689 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0000 GMT 1 Jul 89

[Text] According to reports from the Supreme Soviet session in Moscow, the position of Lithuanian deputies in comparison with that during the congress is improving.

According to academician Antanas Buracas, the points of view of a significant part of the deputies on the political, economic, and social problems of the country are changing almost day by day. Even the so-called passively aggressive majority is starting to differentiate. According to Antanas Buracas, more and more deputies at the session are begining to understand the ideas which were voiced at the congress by Academician Andrey Sakharov, Professor Vytautas Landsbergis, and some other deputies.

More and more support is being given to the Lithuanian deputies by the Ukrainian, Moldavian, and Belorussian deputies. Delegations from Central Asia remain rather ill-disposed toward Lithuanian deputies.

From the 1st day of the congress, and now at the current session of the Supreme Soviet, the idea of decentralization and the sovereignty of republics is defended by the joint efforts of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian deputies.

According to Deputy Kazimiera Prunskine, the new leadership of the USSR is also not unanimous about the idea of economic independence for the republics, which is of especially great importance to Lithuania. According to K. Prunskine, the point of view adopted by Premier N. Ryzhkov and Deputy Premier Leonid Abalkin on the economic independence of the republics cannot be approved by Lithuania.

However, another deputy prime minister, Yuriy Maslukov, has a rather favorable attitude toward Lithuanian economic aspirations; in principle he is not against the idea that Lithuania, and perhaps some other republics, would have their own currency. At the same time, according to academician Antanas Buracas, the rouble has already become a mere formality, as a currency purchasing unit it has practically ceased to exist.

Possible Estonia-Sweden Trade Ties Viewed

LD2707121189 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1030 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Report by (Thomas Nordgren) from Helsinki]

[Excerpts] The Supreme Soviet in Moscow overwhelmingly approved today the transition of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to economic independence. [passage omitted]

The resolutions can be interpreted that Moscow is now giving the go-ahead for responsibility over economic results. However, no clear answer is given on whether the Baltic countries now have the right to introduce their own currency. Estonian economists said today that a precondition for a functioning market economy is the introduction of a convertible currency. Estonia wishes to reintroduce the Estonian crown as a means of payment.

Even though it is still unclear how far the new economic freedom will be stretched, today's decision is greeted with great enthusiasm in all the Baltic states. Over 100,000 people gathered yesterday in Riga to emphasize demands for independence. Economists and politicians are now hoping for help from Sweden. We [as heard] have an acute need of economic education at all levels. We also hope that the Swedes will not only talk, but that trade really will develop.

Next June, the Swedish shipping firm Nordstroem and Thulin will start the first regular ferry traffic between Stockholm and Tallinn. About 1,600 passengers and 100 trucks and cars can then be transported between Estonia and Sweden every other day. If we start with trade and education, that will be our best lifeline, a leading economists in Estonia said today.

Former CPSU Members in Armenia Rehabilitated

NC0907085389 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0425 GMT 7 Jul 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASATAN]

[Text] According to an ARMENPRES report, the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has discussed the question of the former CPSU members and has declared the accusations leveled against them by the judiciary in thrties, forties, and early 1950's to be null and void due to lack of evidence.

The names of the posthumously rehabilitated party members have been published. These people had been accused [word indistinct] for participating in anti-state, counterrevolutionary, nationalistic, anti-soviet, and terrorist organizations. It has now become evident that illegal investigatory methods were used against the accused.

The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau's commission studying the materials on the repressions in the republic in thirties, forties, and early 1950's is continuing its work.

Kashlev Says Democratization 'Irreversible'

AU0707141689 Vienna DER STANDARD in German 7 Jul 89 p 2

[Interview with USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuriy Kashlev by DER STANDARD correspondent Georg Possanner in Alpbach: "To Be Quite Honest, I Am a Convert"—date not given]

[Text] DER STANDARD: Mr Deputy Foreign Minister, are you surprised that "The Gulag Archipelago," the distressing book by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, who was ignominiously chased out of the country 15 years ago, can now be published in the USSR?

Kashlev: No, I am not. At the Congress of People's Deputies a deputy asked the question whether one should not only publish his book, but give Solzhenitsyn back his USSR citizenship. I support both moves, because there is no limit to our glasnost, and everything can be published.

DER STANDARD: I wonder whether you have always secretly held this view or whether you have changed your mind since Gorbachev came to power?

Kashlev: To be quite honest, I have changed my opinion. Some 8 or 10 years ago, I thought that people of this kind would harm our country. At that time I was of course not familiar with the scope of Stalinist terrorism. Now that we know more and have changed our views on what is "anti-Soviet," we ourselves have also changed.

DER STANDARD: So you feel that you are a convert and have not just fallen in with somebody else's view?

Kashlev: That is right, I am a convert. I am glad that with my work as the delegation head at the CSCE follow-up conference in Vienna and the human rights meetings, I have contributed to democratization.

DER STANDARD: Is Western pressure not also responsible for the improvement of the human rights situation in the USSR?

Kashlev: First of all, it has been an internal process—it is new thinking, Gorbachev, and a new generation. This combination and the new leadership's desire to shape our lives in line with a civilized attitude and in accordance with the international obligations that we have accepted, have contributed to this improvement. The process has not yet been concluded. The West's pressure was much stronger 10 years ago but it led to nothing, and was even harmful at times.

DER STANDARD: Are there still any political prisoners in the USSR?

Kashlev: We discuss this topic continuously with the United States. According to their lists there are about 30. However, these prisoners have not been put in prison for political reasons alone; they have committed criminal offenses as well. They are, for example people, who have committed crimes and wanted to leave the country illegally.

DER STANDARD: What is the connection between improving human rights and glasnost? Do you regard this connection as irreversible?

Kashlev: The process of democratization is absolutely irreversible. Without glasnost there would have been no change in our attitude in the sphere of human rights. Glasnost is the engine of perestroyka in all fields. I consider glasnost to be the greatest achievement of Gorbachev's 4 years in power.

DER STANDARD: What is your definition of glasnost?

Kashlev: Openness on the part of the leadership, and the fact that the people have the opportunity to have their own views and to make their own decisions.

Popular Front's Savisaar Receives Estonian Posts

LD0907180389 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1600 GMT 9 Jul 89

[Excerpt] [Announcer] In Estonia the Popular Front leader Edgar Savisaar has sensationally been appointed deputy chairman.

[Correspondent] The game to win political power in Estonia took a new and dramatic turn today. The Estonian Communist Party newspaper RAHVA HAAL writes today that the leader of the Estonian Popular Front has been appointed deputy chairman in the Estonian government and in addition to that he becomes the chief of the important Planning Committee.

At the moment there is a closed meeting of the Popular Front's Council in the little town of Pulva in southeastern Estonia. News that the leader of the Popular Front has been appointed as deputy chairman was received with mixed feelings. The Popular Front's moderate wing believes that it is a victory for and in aspirations of independence, but the radical wing believes Savisaar has sold himself all too cheaply.

During the week Edgar Savisaar strongly criticized the Popular Front's left wing and said that the extremists in the Estonian independence party are as dangerous as the Interfront movement, which is led from Moscow and which pursues the Russian population's cause. Edgar Savisaar also said that the Communist Party is all too passive and that the Popular Front is the only movement strong enough to guide Estonia. Today, when he has become deputy chairman and the highest chief of Estonia's planning economy, it is easier to understand what he meant.

Is it possible, however, to be Popular Front leader and simultaneously sit in the government? Is it possible to support market economy and at the same time be chief for planning economy? According to information which leaked out from the Popular Front's secret meeting today, Savisaar has forcefully talked for cooperation with Moscow and warned for confrontation. He has totally distanced himself from the Lithuanian Popular Front Sajudis' demands to unilaterally declare null and void the communist seizing of the power in 1940 in connection with the secret protocol of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact.

Edgar Savisaar said today that his governmental post makes it possible to quickly implement economic independence for Estonia. How many chairs can one sit on at the same time? How can Savisaar, who does not have basic economic knowledge, be Planning Committee

chief? Is today's political development a victory for the Popular Front or is it an unusually clever deed of the Communist Party's conservative wing to put one of its worse critics in a post where he suddenly takes responsibility on everything he has criticized? [passage omitted]

'Socioeconomic Sovereignty' of Republics Urged

PM070703789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In Line with the New Demands"]

[Text] A roundtable discussion on the topic "Socioeconomic Problems of National Relations" has taken place at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences.

Social scientists, USSR people's deputies, and party workers representing union and autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts discussed a wide range of topical problems concerning interethnic relations under socialism.

Opening the session, R. Yanovskiy, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, stressed that in the sphere of nationalities policy and interethnic relations discussion should center on restoring Leninist principles and methodology in solving problems and the need to revise a number of prevailing views on them in line with the new demands in the approach to ideological and social processes and the new political thinking. The linkage between improving interethnic relations and the economic, sociopolitical, and spiritual factors of developing socialism was also discussed.

During discussion the roundtable participants noted that the formation of a new type of economic relations between republics and regions should constitute the politicoeconomic basis of nationalities policy under the new conditions. Regional economic accountability could be a major step in deepening economic reform.

At the same time, speakers noted that there is clearly no alternative to the USSR's development as an integrated national economic complex. The main thing here is to achieve the optimum combination of the objectives and tasks for the development of the regions and the country as a whole, the combination of the centralized solution of strategic problems of significance for the whole national economic complex and the autonomy and responsibility of regional management structures in developing all spheres of activity on their own territory. On the whole, the session stressed, discussion should center on strengthening the socioeconomic sovereignty of union republics and other national-state formations, the precise formulation of the legal bases of the functioning of all-union and regional political structures, and the development of socialist democracy and social self-management.

Yeltsin on Western View of Soviet 'Crisis'

LD1107101989

[Editorial Report] Moscow International Service in Czech and Slovak at 1700 GMT on 10 July broadcasts a 6-minute report on remarks by Supreme Soviet deputies on prospects for reform in the Soviet Union.

The report states that some Western media insist that the USSR will finally abandon its policy of democratization and restructuring because it creates too many problems for the government. Radio Moscow interviews with several Supreme Soviet deputies on this Western assumption are cited.

Boris Yeltsin said: I know that many peoople abroad insist that the Soviet Union is going through a crisis today, that this crisis has affected economic, financial, social and even the nationality spheres. But why should we conclude that we are on the brink of collapse, that an explosion could occur in the Soviet Union at any moment? I would not draw such conclusions. We have enough time to overcome difficulties and we will fight to overcome them.

Professor Denisov speaks about the fact that economic crises in the West were to a certain degree a spur toward further progress, and this also applies to the Soviet Union, where democratization and restructuring will find a way out of stagnation. He stressed that despite a small minority of people who are nostalgic for Stalinist order, there is no danger of an antidemocratic reversal.

Deputy (Bruskiniyova) speaks about the advantages of financial autonomy based on the economies of individual Soviet republics—and that the Baltic republics would be the first to benefit.

Murashev Discusses Relationship With Gorbachev

AU1707193589 Vienna PROFIL in German 17 Jul 89 pp 38-39

[Interview with Arkadiy Murashev, member of the Soviet People's Congress Committee on Science and Culture and leading member of the "Supraregional Deputies' Group" surrounding Andrey Sakharov and Boris Yeltsin, in Moscow: "Gorbachev—As Strong as Never Before?"—date not given]

[Text] PROFIL: Mr Murashev, what do you think about Mikhail Gorbachev following the People's Congress session? He has often been reproached for having manipulated the congress.

Murashev: Of course he has constantly manipulated it, both the progressive minority and the conservative majority. Many district party secretaries are even more annoyed than the democrats. I guess that out of the roughly 100 votes against Gorbachev, 70 came from the right and 30 from the left.

PROFIL: What do you mean by "left"?

Murashev: By the "left" we mean progressive people, in other words, people who are in favor of market economy, democracy, and freedom. The right is conservative. Our conservatives want to continue to live as they have done in the past.

PROFIL: Has your relationship with Gorbachev changed?

Murashev: I have a genuine problem in this respect. The voters' relationship with Gorbachev has deteriorated. People are disappointed, not only in Moscow but throughout the country. As for me, it is the other way round. I understand Gorbachev better now, and my attitude to him is more positive now. However, all my voters are currently totally against him, and I have difficulty in explaining this contradiction to them.

PROFIL: Why do you see this differently from the people?

Murashev: The people do not understand Gorbachev's tactics; we are lacking political culture in this respect. Everybody believes that a party chief must counter different opinions in an authoritarian way and must put a fist on the table. However, Gorbachev behaves in an entirely different way. He just ignores the proposals that he does not like, and disregards unpleasant moves. In this way, conservative proposals have failed—proposals against the cooperatives, for instance.

PROFIL: Why did Gorbachev have himself elected at the beginning of the session, without any discussion?

Murashev: Many people believe that Gorbachev was afraid of facing the vote following an open discussion. Perhaps he would not then have got 95 percent, but only 70 percent. I think so too; it was an approach that was morally indefensible. However, we must understand how difficult it is to chair such a large assembly involving so many contradictions. I talked to Gorbachev several times following the congress, and I am now convinced that his plans reach far beyond what has been achieved to date.

PROFIL: Time and again, Andrey Sakharov has talked about the immediate danger of a putsch against Gorbachev. Is this realistic?

Murashev: Gorbachev is quite a character. He has the rightists as well as the leftists under control. I think that in the party he is stronger than he has ever been before. That the army or the KGB would attempt to overthrow him is unrealistic in my view. The army is not in agreement, as we saw with respect to the army representatives in the People's Congress. Clearly, there were two groups: the generals on the one hand, and the lower officers' ranks up to colonel, on the other. In our supraregional deputies' group we have about 10 military officers, some of them made quite a radical appearance in the People's Congress.

PROFIL: What has become of the supraregional opposition group in the People's Congress?

Murashev: We are a legal parliamentary opposition. Without the Balts, we make up 300 people's deputies. However, we do not yet have a political program. What unites us is our dissatisfaction with the prevailing state of affairs. We have made alternative proposals everywhere. Andrey Sakharov, for instance, is on the Supreme Soviet Constitution Committee. (Footnote) (People's Deputy Sakharov is not a member of the 542-man standing parliament—the Supreme Soviet—but half the committee members are deputies of the larger People's Congress which has 2,250 members) He will submit his own draft constitution to that panel.

PROFIL: Who are the members of the progressive group?

Murashev: Most of them come from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]: 76 from Moscow and 25 from Leningrad, 30 from the Urals and Siberia. The central Asian republics are represented by one or two deputies each. We have formed a coordination council of about 30 persons, as well as a smaller permanent work committee.

PROFIL: You do not have a newspaper.

Murashev: We have one in the form of an information bulletin called CHRONIKA which was founded during the People's Congress session and is published by Viktor Mironov. While it is produced with a run of only a few copies, it is photocopied in many places. In this way we have achieved a circulation of tens of thousands in over 100 cities. The bulletin carries interviews with deputies such as Telman Gdlyan and Yuriy Afanasyev, and it publishes our statements. Our official organ will be called THE PEOPLE'S DEPUTY.

PROFIL: What role does Andrey Sakharov play in the opposition group?

Murashev: His name is our flag, he is the great moral authority. The most important politician at present is Boris Yeltsin, a man of Gorbachevian stature. However, regrettably he participates in internal work only to a limited degree, so that we have a genuine leadership problem. Yeltsin is a CPSU Central Committee member, and perhaps he does not want to create the impression of being publicly opposed to Gorbachev.

PROFIL: Have things not become conspicuously quiet around Yeltsin since he became the chairman of the building committee in the Supreme Soviet?

Murashev: Yeltsin was the only one to become a Supreme Soviet committee chairman on the basis of a programmatic statement. He also defended Andrey Sakharov and agreed with his "Decree on Power." When tens of thousands of people rallied in front of the Luzhniki stadium in Moscow during the People's Congress session, he was almost always there.

PROFIL: What will become of Boris Yeltsin?

Murashev: He has allegedly been envisaged for the office of RSFSR head of government in the period following the regional elections in the spring of 1990; this office is now held by Vitaliy Vorotnikov.

PROFIL: What are your group's next plans?

Murashev: There will be regional elections in 8 months. We must also prepare for the fall session of the People's Congress, which will discuss the new constitution. We want Sakharov's "Decree on Power" to be discussed but, above all, Article 6 of the Constitution on the party's leading role must be dropped.

PROFIL: Is it not a contradiction that you advocate a multiparty system but intend to become a CPSU member yourself?

Murashev: I am a CPSU candidate member. My admission to the party will be decided in December. The one-party system is already an illusion now. In the CPSU there are people with entirely different views. You can no longer call it a unity party. On the other hand, the CPSU is the only real political power in the country. The greater the pluralism in the party, the better. After all, exposed representatives of the left are also party members—people such as Telman Gdlyan, Boris Yeltsin, Gavril Popov, Yuriy Afanasyev.

PROFIL: Mr Murashev, in what way has your life changed since you became a people's deputy?

Murashev: Formerly, I sat at the computer night after night; now I hurry from one meeting to the next, from one session to the next. The High Temperature Physics Institute of the Academy of Sciences continues to pay me my salary of R230 (Footnote) (Average Soviet salary, equivalent to 4,600 schillings), but my colleagues do not let me work. They say that, after all, we have elected you to the People's Congress.

PROFIL: What is the work of a Soviet people's deputy like?

Murashev: I get R200 as a deputy. However, I do not have a telephone, a computer, or a telefax machine, nor do I have the money to pay a secretary or an aide. This is an untenable situation. In the election campaign, I had many voluntary helpers. Now my institute helps me: A 3-room apartment has been made available to me as an office, and they pay me an aide. The Supreme Soviet has promised us an office building in Kalininprospekt.

PROFIL: Do you maintain contact with your voters?

Murashev: In my constituency, Timiryazevskiy, I meet my voters in the main square in front of the Yerevan cinema every Saturday at 1600. Up to 5,000 people come to the meeting. They write questions on scraps of paper, and I report on my work. I have also taken part in discussions in research institutes and enterprises. I get about five letters every day. Half of the writers of these letters want me to help them to get an apartment faster. In Moscow that takes 8 years, even if you have proved that you are entitled to an apartment.

PROFIL: What interests your voters most?

Murashev: For the moment, most questions are about the case of people's deputy Telman Gdlyan. He is the public prosecutor who has been suspended from office and who hunts corrupt people, a man who also investigated Politburo member Yigor Ligachev. A commission of the People's Congress under the chairmanship of historian Roy Medvedev is examining Gdlyan's reproaches as well as the accusations made against him that he used illegal means in uncovering corruption in Uzbekistan.

PROFIL: What does the party leadership of your constituency think of you?

Murashev: Officially, they have promised to support me. However, I have realized that they are collecting material on me. At all meetings somebody always makes notes on what I say about Gorbachev, for instance.

Public Reaction to Congress Relays Outlined

PM0607100789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 7

[Unattributed report on interview with Boris Vartanyan, editor-consultant in the Central Television Main Letters and Sociological Research Desk: "Congress Through Viewers' Eyes"]

[Text] In the last issue of the television page (IZVESTIYA No 168) we talked about Central Television's coverage of the work of the congress of USSR People's Deputies. Via direct relays millions of television viewers witnessed this most important event of the year. Of course, the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting could not fail to be concerned by their opinion. A sociological poll was conducted, admittedly only among Muscovites, but its results help to form a fairly objective picture.

Boris Vartanyan, editor-consultant in the Central Television Main Letters and Sociological Research Desk, says:

Three hundred and fifty people representing all Moscow's social groups participated in the poll. The direct relays on the second program were watched by 57 percent of those questioned: The relays were mainly in working hours. Nonetheless, half of the employees, engineering and technical personnel, and workers in science, art, and education watched and listened to deputies' speeches, even if not all of them. Only 42 percent of workers questioned managed to do this. During those days 92 percent of school pupils and students at vocational and technical schools, 72 percent of students at higher educational institutions and technical schools, and 75 percent of pensioners watched the coverage.

We asked: Did the direct relays help to objectively assess the progress of the congress' work? Affirmative answers were received from 86 percent of the poll participants; 11 percent did not know.

The first program news bulletins about the congress were watched by 55 percent of the audience, including those who followed the direct relays. It turned out that many people wanted to clarify certain statements and ideas expressed by the deputies. And another 12 percent of those questioned watched the Moscow program in order to get a better understanding of events. Only 5 percent had no interest at all in the televising of the congress. Of those who watched the first program bulletins, about 23 percent thought that the material was cut in a biased manner, and another 8 percent thought that the reportages on the congress' work were not objective.

The work of the teams of journalists, of course, was also discussed. Some 15 percent of Muscovites reproached them for lacking a creative approach, and about the same number—16 percent—thought that their work was interesting and highly skilled. But a total of 28 percent of those questioned were dissatisfied with television and radio journalists' work. This is what they wanted in future—there should be more interviews with well known people and more reportages on the work of deputies' groups, journalists should not be sparing with commentaries, and they should provide opportunities for the clash of opposing views.

In any case the poll participants also assessed deputies' speeches. And although this was not directly connected with Central Television's work, nonetheless we listened to their opinion. Most Moscow viewers thought that the speeches made by representatives from Moscow, Leningrad and the Baltic republics were genuinely democratic, and in the restructuring spirit.

There was one more question in the questionnaire which interested us: Did the direct relay affect the USSR's international prestige? The majority—55 percent—said that this was indisputable because the irreversibility of the restructuring processes was demonstrated to the entire world. One in five Muscovites decided that the relays did not have any noticeable effect on the opinion formed about our country. There were also viewers—9 percent—who gave the following answer: The direct relays gave the West a rather different picture of society from that created by "diplomatic efforts," one which was more detailed and made it possible to see far more problems in our country.

But as far as the Muscovites were concerned, the main and most useful result of Central Television's unprecedented reporting of the congress' work was that this increased interest in "uncensored" (I quote) information. It is precisely in this way, they stressed, that political culture is formed and the active life stance which is so essential for the cause of restructuring is cultivated. Only two percent of Moscow's viewers were dissatisfied with Central Television's work. As a rule, we sociologists heard expressions of gratitude. And primarily, of course, for the direct relays....

Gdlyan Repeats 'Kremlin Scandal' Charge

PM2707123189 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 22 Jul 89 pp 10-11

[Interview with "Judge" Telman Gdlyan by Ezio Mauro in Moscow; date not given]

[Excerpt] Moscow—[introductory passage omitted] Now Judge Gdlyan, who joined the party in 1962, reflects on his experience as the judge who saw the Soviet mafia with his own eyes and was stopped by corrupt authorities, in the name of the party itself. For the first time, he has decided to recount that experience (with its corpses, suspicions and fears, chauffeurs chosen from among trusted Komsomol [Communist Youth League] athletes, and a bodyguard that at night kept watch on his car using a rudimentary alarm involving electric wires suspended from the yard to his bedroom), having refused throughout the inquiry to talk with Western journalists: "We communists must resolve our own troubles and we must have nothing to do with the bourgeoisie. You cannot help: You are flirting with the new USSR because it suits you, but you want our country to arrive exhausted at the international negotiating table. Because I love the USSR I have decided now that I must speak out and must use a foreign newspaper: Soviet newspapers are forbidden to me. I am speaking out because they are silencing me. And because in a year's time it could be too late.

[Mauro] Judge Gdlyan, when did the mafia first enter your life?

[Gdlyan] It was 6 years ago, in June 1983. I had just completed an investigation in Estonia when I was ordered to take the first flight to Bukhara, where a militia unit chief had been arrested by the KGB for receiving a R1,000 bribe. At first I felt offended: I am a "special cases" judge; how can they send me to Uzbekistan to investigate some business about thefts and bribery? However, I did not know that Andropov was behind the investigation, so it was an important matter.

[Mauro] So it was Andropov who gave the go-ahead to the struggle against the mafia: Did you meet with him before leaving for Uzbekistan?

[Gdlyan] No, I did not speak with him, but I learned what I needed to know from one of his men. Andropov was general secretary but still "took care of" the KGB, which he had directed for years, so he knew everything: He knew the influence of the mafia groups that dominated in certain areas and also their potential danger. According to my superiors, I should have resolved the entire matter within 2-3 months. But after 3 months I recognized that this business was to change my entire life. Because it was not an ordinary corruption case: In Uzbekistan I had uncovered the mafia.

[Mauro] What kind of mafia?

[Gdlyan] It was above suspicion. The moment I guessed who I was dealing with I examined what had happened in Italy. I recognized that the Sicilian Mafia is like a whore who does not conceal her occupation, whereas the Soviet mafia is a prostitute who tries to protect her respectability. So everyone talks about the former, which proceeds from crime to involve politics, but not much about the latter, which uses politics as a tool and cover for crime.

[Mauro] So did you recognize immediately, in the first 3 months, that the inquiry would have to enter the party sanctuary?

[Gdlyan] Yes, inevitably. The most obvious thing was the cotton swindle, with whole areas of land disappearing from the maps, from Uzbekistan's geography, thus enabling the mafia to falsify the harvest figures and to pocket R4 billion—that is, some $6.5 billion. But this was possible thanks to the network of corruption that sustained and guaranteed the swindle. Bribes were handed over everywhere—at home, in hotels, on aircraft, at plenums. And for anything at all—to find a job or enter a school; to obtain promotions, visas, dachas, medicines, medals. The rule was simple: If you want something, you must give to someone higher up; in order to give, you must take from someone below.

[Mauro] Judge, let us move on from the rule to specific cases: Everyone was giving, but who was taking?

[Gdlyan] Leaders of the party, the soviet, the government, and the judicial offices of the Bukhara area. All the leads pointed there. At the end of 1983 I went to my superiors and explained to them that the inquiry could not be closed but must in fact be extended to reach the big-timers. When they heard I was investigating the first secretary of Bukhara Oblast, Karimov, they told us to stop. In a way, I can understand it: Never before had a party secretary been accused and prosecuted like a common criminal.

[Mauro] Who are these people who wanted to block the investigation from the outset?

[Gdlyan] General Prosecutor Rekunkov and his deputy, Soroka. They are the main ones to blame for incomplete justice having been done. But now I know that they too were only tools in the hands of certain circles in Moscow that wanted to cover up this business at all costs, because it led straight to the capital. I was engaged in a bitter fight with Soroka for 5 years, from the day he summoned me, and, foaming at the mouth and shouting, he ordered me to keep my inquiry outside the offices of members of the Central Committee and Supreme Soviet. I replied to him that I was answerable only to the law and to my communist conscience and could not obey illegal orders. So we went ahead.

[Mauro] But how could you investigate against the wishes of the Prosecutor's Office?

[Gdlyan] By means of an out-and-out struggle with the general prosecutor, which is still going on. I summoned Judge Ivanov—whom I had known since the inquiry into the Caucasian millionaires—to work with me. Despite all the obstacles, in August 1984 we succeeded in arresting Karimov thanks to the irrefutable evidence presented to the Prosecutor's Office. It was a breach in the wall of corruption and impunity, because a precedent was being set, whereby in the USSR, too, men were equal before the law, irrespective of party posts. The mafia recognized this—so much so that it did its utmost behind our backs to make Karimov commit suicide.

[Mauro] How?

[Gdlyan] With a piece of good advice. The president of the republic, Salimov, warned him that he would be arrested, but also told him that he still had a chance "to make a courageous decision"—that is, to leave forever, taking all the most dangerous secrets with him. Fortunately, the oblast committee first secretary loved life, as shown by the R6 million (almost $10 million) in gold and money that he kept buried at relatives' homes. Now Salimov has been arrested. But in other cases the recommendation of a good death was successful.

[Mauro] So the president of the republic was not the only one to preach suicide?

[Gdlyan] No. In the case of Uzbek Interior Minister Ergashev, the suggestion came directly from the local Central Committee. Coming straight to the point, they telephoned him to tell him that we had arrived with an arrest warrant, so "he had to make a decision." All this was normal; we had spies everywhere in the Prosecutor's Office and within the party. But the terrible thing is that we knew the weakness of Ergashev's character and were afraid that he would accept the "advice" at any moment. They too knew that he was weak and could have told everything. This is why he had to be prepared for suicide. Soroka, the deputy general prosecutor, signed the arrest

warrant but, on instructions from above, kept us inactive for a week by changing his mind every day, as he waited for Ergashev to commit suicide. We were in Tashkent, confined to our office, waiting to be able to move, and we recognized that it was becoming a dirty game. Then Ergashev went to see Adylov, the real leader in that area. The following morning he returned and at 0700 shot himself in the head in the garden of his home.

[Mauro] Were you not wrong not to stop that suicide by whatever means?

[Gdlyan] There was nothing else I could do. We were fully aware that Ergashev knew many things, but the others knew it too. Indeed, they knew that if he did talk, it would cause an explosion not only in Uzbekistan but in Moscow too. So they stopped him. We recognized that he was going to kill himself, but could do nothing about it. We knew he had gathered his entire family together to say goodbye and we awaited a telephone call that never came.

[Mauro] This story features Adylov—a proper party despot, who transformed the Uzbek village of Gurumsaray into a medieval fiefdom whose citizens were reduced to the level of serfs. Was it he who gave the final suicide order to the interior minister?

[Gdlyan] No, it came in two telehpone calls from the Central Committee in Tashkent. But Adylov and Ergashev were two of a kind, very close to Rashidov, the former Uzbek party chief, on whose personal staff Adylov worked as "cadres" supervisor. That meant that all promotions, moves, and reports passed through his hands, together with bribes, recommendations, and the anonymous letters written by Usmankhodzhayev, who was to become republican first secretary but who was entirely subservient to him. Adylov was at the center of the corrupt system of exchange that we have been talking about—a man who did not want official power because in practice he was Rashidov's grand vizir and had accumulated a vast, unimaginable personal fortune.

[Mauro] Was that not enough to secure his arrest?

[Gdlyan] If we had taken Ergashev alive we would have reached Adylov in a single leap. After the minister's death we decided to wait, because our prey was too big and the evidence had to be very strong in order to overcome the resistance that protected him. But suddenly Adylov was arrested. He was seized by his own people, together with the Uzbek KGB and republic Prosecutor's Office, in order to remove him from our reach, and he was sent straight to Moscow.

[Mauro] So you lost two key men at a stroke: How did the investigation manage to resume?

[Gdlyan] It was thanks to Adylov. We were devastated, but we reckoned that he was not happy either. Then his peasant cunning prompted him to summon me. I met with him in jail: "You know, Telman Aka," he said, using a courteous oriental form of address, "your enemies are now my enemies." I did not understand, but he explained to me that his brothers had also been arrested, whereas the accomplices whom he had made rich had betrayed and abandoned him, so he found himself paying for the organization's crimes on his own. Finally, he asked me to include his file in my inquiry. In exchange he would reveal to me the names of the mafia leaders, who were in Moscow.

[Mauro] Was Adylov in a position to do so?

[Gdlyan] Yes, his strength lies entirely in his oriental capacity for blackmail, based on tape recordings, photographs, and letters proving who received a certain sum, and when, and from whom. He recorded everything meticulously, like a mafia administrator, and ordered his people who carried bribes to Moscow always to secure evidence of having delivered, somehow or other. He was willing to hand us his vast archives, with photographs proving the criminal links between Tashkent and Moscow.

[Mauro] Did he name names in his meetings with you?

[Gdlyan] He did, and his also supplied evidence. He said that they were all names from the Uzbek side of the mafia. He would only talk about the Moscow side when the inquiry into him was included in our investigation. Despite all this, the Prosecutor's Office never passed us his file, and the reason for it is clear. Thus Adylov still has his secrets even today, and nobody bothers him.

[Mauro] But is Adylov not afraid of being killed?

[Gdlyan] Think of his records. Everyone knows they exist, but nobody knows where. This is why Adylov did not meet the same fate as Davydov.

[Mauro] The former Uzbek first deputy interior minister. Are you saying he was killed?

[Gdlyan] I am not saying that. But I do know that when we were at last given permission to arrest him the general prosecutor himself communicated the information to a deputy interior minister of the USSR. The latter told the head of the ministry's "radist" department, who sent one of his men to Uzbekistan to warn Davydov. In order to gain time and to see how serious the threat was, Davydov had himself admitted to a military hospital, even though he was as sound as an ox—a well fed ox. We asked to send one of our experts there from Moscow to conduct a medical examination, but we were forbidden from doing so. Then Davydov committed suicide.

[Mauro] What? In the hospital?

[Gdlyan] With three bullets through his brain. I repeat—three. The Uzbek Prosecutor's Office investigation established that it was entirely normal and that a suicide can shoot himself in the head three times in a row.

[Mauro] How did you react to your witnesses' transformation into corpses?

[Gdlyan] In the only possible way—by changing tactic. We stopped reporting our intentions, step by step, to the top people at the Prosecutor's Office and stopped presenting our evidence gathered at every stage. Now we would get to the very bottom, until the evidence became overwhelming, at which point we would request an arrest warrant. If this was withheld, they would have to put it in writing. This is how we proceeded with Kashkhadarya Oblast Party First Secretary Gaipov, one of the top mafia people. There was irrefutable evidence. The Prosecutor's Office gave us the arrest warrant but prevented us from using it.

[Mauro] What? They signed it but prevented its being used?

[Gdlyan] Yes, the left hand did not know what the right was doing. The deputy general prosecutor ordered us not to arrest him at home. And yet in recent years Gaipov had accumulated—in gold alone—more than R10 million, some $16 million. If we wanted to question him, however, we had to get him out and take him to the Prosecutor's Office. Only there could we arrest him. It was crazy, and any investigator anywhere in the world would have refused to obey. We had only one path open to us. We tried to obey that diabolical order.

[Mauro] How?

[Gdlyan] By going there incognito, with tickets bought under false names, because the mafia watched the stations and airports and kept an eye on us. This time, however, we were officials sent to supervise the cotton harvest, ready to congratulate everyone (from the oblast committee to the police and the local Prosecutor's Office) and even capable of playing the tourists, with no hurry. So Saturday and Sunday passed. Finally, Monday morning at 0600 hours we surrounded Gaipov's house without the police or chauffeurs knowing what we were doing. Judge Abdurakhimov and I knocked at the door, without stating our real names and, using the cotton story as a cover, secured an audience with Gaipov, who was having breakfast. It was a magnificent house, his tsarina-wife compared her husband to Lenin; I even managed to play with their litte granddaughter while asking Gaipov to come to the Prosecutor's Office to sign a document that would enable us to complete our visit. He examined us, however, asked questions, displayed his jacket with his Order of Lenin and the gold star of Hero of Socialist Labor, and refused to leave the house.

[Mauro] Had he been warned?

[Gdlyan] I do not know. He played for time, meanwhile sizing us up. What did we city men recommend: Was it better for him to wear light or heavy clothes? Would it rain that day? What car should we take—his or ours? Then he asked his daughter for a handkerchief, she replied that it was in his room, and he stood up. I and the other judge looked each other in the eye, anxious not to reveal ourselves by following him. We sat still. After a few moments, however, a terrible scream from his daughter could be heard through the house, and then his wife, who was next to us, started crying. Everyone seemed to know. We ran off and there, behind a blood-stained curtain, next to the girl, who was tearing out her hair, we saw a ghastly oriental spectacle: Gaipov, grasping a bloodstained knife, still stabbing himself repeatedly in the chest. I seized his wrist. A tall, huge man, he immediately took the knife in his left hand, and I instinctively drew back, thinking that he intended to attack me. But he started stabbing himself again. He just wanted to die; he was fully aware that he was finished.

[Mauro] Did he confess anything to you?

[Gdlyan] Nothing. He fell onto the cushions as his wife and daughter screamed a thousand curses at us. I hoped that he would survive and was trying to give him air by fanning him with a towel, when he pushed me away with one hand: "Ukhodite"—"Go away." Then he signed to his daughter to approach, and she was shouting at us: "Bastards! Go away! Let him speak his last words!" I believe that she wanted to find out where the stolen gold was hidden and he wanted to tell her, but we never left them alone, even in the ambulance, until Gaipov died on the operating table. In the house we found just R1 million—that is, around $1.5 million; it is estimated that he accumulated and hid tens and tens of millions in gold, cash, and jewels.

[Mauro] Was it not a failure of the second tactic—that of surprise—too?

[Gdlyan] That is why when we later arrested Uzbek Interior Minister Yakhyayev in 1986, we were accused of brutality. We took him away in his pajamas and slippers. After what had happened, we could take no more chances.

[Mauro] Judge, why is the republican interior minister constantly at the center of the scandal?

[Gdlyan] Because that is the heart of law and order—the place from which all controls should originate—so when the mafia succeeds in seizing it, it has won. And bear in mind that we were ready to arrest another interior minister—Ibragimov. We had hard evidence, but we were not authorized to go ahead. However, this does not alter the facts. Somehow, for 24 years three different interior ministers who should have protected the state's interests did the contrary. That is the tragedy of Uzbekistan—and not just Uzbekistan.

[Mauro] Do you mean that the mafia involves other republics?

[Gdlyan] We know about Uzbekistan because there was the investigation, but the country is swamped with organized crime, which holds economic and political leverage, with a turnover in the shadow economy of R100 billion—$160 billion. And if this state of affairs continues, it is not impossible that these forces could gain the upper hand in the country—that is, seize power.

[Mauro] Has not something similar already happened, in the Brezhnev era?

[Gdlyan] Yes, to a large extent. Between 1983 and 1988, our investigation led to around 60 arrests—almost all of them of leaders of the party, the soviets, and the internal administration during the period of stagnation, who were involved in illegal dealings worth tens and tens of billions of rubles. They include Brezhnev's son-in-law, Yuriy Churbanov, who was taking bribes from Uzbek Council of Ministers Chairman Khudayberdyyev; [Supreme] Soviet Chairman Salimov; and republic First Secretary Usmankhodzhayev. Yet General Prosecutor Rekunkov did everything possible to drive Churbanov to suicide, to make him "courageously" follow his chief, Shchelokov—Brezhnev's interior minister, who killed himself together with his secrets. In short, the wall of obstruction was massive. That is why in 1987 we approached the Central Committee through Boris Yeltsin, who was a Politburo candidate member at that time, and only in that way did we succeed in charging Churbanov.

[Mauro] Is not the fact that such an important personality as Churbanov—a Central Committee member—ended up on trial a turning point in the USSR's political and legal practices?

[Gdlyan] I would not be so optimistic. They circled around Churbanov for a year without charging him, the case was concluded in 4 months, and two defendants such as Minister Yakhyayev and his Deputy Kakhramanov were wrongly released. Moreover, many charges against Churbanov were dropped. All this was in order to show that we had exaggerated and were not credible.

[Mauro] But why, if the press initially presented the results of your investigation as a kind of judicial path to socialism?

[Gdlyan] The reason why is very clear. The Uzbek trail had now led us to Moscow, and we had already prepared an investigation into certain important people in the Central Committee, into the people linked with the mafia in the capital.

[Mauro] Are you saying that they stopped you when high-ranking names in the party in Moscow emerged in the investigation?

[Gdlyan] That is exactly how it went. As soon as some names in the Central Committee appeared on our file, a campaign against us in order to discredit us began, in a holy alliance of all the old corrupt forces in the party, the state, the judiciary, and the mass media, until 4 May they succeeded in taking the investigation away from us.

[Mauro] Who took it away from you?

[Gdlyan] Let us say that this decision was taken by corrupt elements who are more high-ranking than the General Prosecutor's Office and who are in authority over it.

[Mauro] So the key to the whole scandal lies in Moscow?

[Gdlyan] Yes, and it is the protectors of the mafia concealed here in the capital who keep speaking of an "Uzbek scandal." I take the responsibility for stating that the documents prove the contrary. The documents prove that this is a real "Moscow scandal," or, more precisely, a "Kremlin scandal."

[Mauro] You are saying some extremely grave things; do you have evidence?

[Gdlyan] It seems to me that similar things happen in Italy and in other countries, if I am not mistaken. But rest assured; I would not say these things unless I could prove them by documents and at any time. When we recognized that they wished to wreck and destroy our investigation work, we placed the evidence in safekeeping. The documents are there and are in safekeeping, in various places.

[Mauro] Judge, is this not the same method as that of the despot Adylov?

[Gdlyan] You are wrong. Adylov took care of documents for criminal purposes; we do so in order to ensure that justice triumphs. The time will come, because time is working against our opponents, and then the documents will be useful.

[Mauro] Were you right to fear tampering with the evidence?

[Gdlyan] Listen. I have seen 70 people excluded from the investigation—that is, all the best investigators. They were replaced by people whose sole task is to wreck everything by destroying the evidence. In fact they do much more. They take the accused to the KGB offices and force them through various pressures to deny the accusations made in the past against the Moscow leaders, promising then to release them. New General Prosecutor Sukharev himself went to the prison in order to persuade Usmankhodzhayev not to reveal the names of those who were pocketing bribes in the Central Committee, here in Moscow.

[Mauro] And do you know these names?

[Gdlyan] Who should know them if not ourselves after an investigation which has taken 6 years?

[Mauro] Can you confirm that the name of Yegor Ligachev is also involved in the investigation?

[Gdlyan] I can confirm that there is evidence in the investigation on the links of some individuals accused of corruption with Central Committee secretaries and Politburo members—Grishin, Romanov, Aliyev, Kapitonov, Solomentsev, and Ligachev. But these links also include a number of section chiefs in the CPSU Central Committee apparatus and a mass of ministers, including former Minister of Land Reclamation and Water Resources Vasilyev, Tarasov of light industry, Mesyats of agriculture, and many others. There are also high-ranking representatives of the country's legal system in the group.

[Mauro] But does Gorbachev know these things?

[Gdlyan] We have informed the Central Committee.

[Mauro] Have you discussed the investigation personally with the general secretary?

[Gdlyan] I have spoken twice with Mikhail Sergeyevich, on 3 and 10 May.

[Mauro] General Prosecutor Sukharev maintains that in accusing Ligachev you have forgotten the presumption of innocence. How do you reply?

[Gdlyan] Where was the sacred principle of the presumption of innocence when party Control Committee Chairman Pugo, General Prosecutor Sukharev, the committee [as published] of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the mass media accused us of various crimes without even a shred of evidence? As for Ligachev, I can only repeat now what I have already said. We have reached our conclusions on the basis of evidence and documents.

[Mauro] But Sukharev has assured the congress that Ligachev has committed no crime. Who is right?

[Gdlyan] We do not say that he is a criminal. We speak of evidence contained in the file of the investigation into corruption, and we ask only to continue the investigation in order to finally establish the truth. But they are preventing us from so doing. Who is breaking the law—we or they?

"Facts Speak for Themselves"

[Mauro] However, Sukharev maintains that there all kinds of things in your investigation—"the truth about the mafia but also dangerous lies." Can you reply?

[Gdlyan] I asked leave to reply to the congress, but this was denied. Now that I have decided to speak out, I believe that the facts speak for themselves. Sukharev's remarks reflect the illegitimate interests of high-ranking people implicated in our investigation.

[Mauro] What lesson do you draw from this affair?

[Gdlyan] Unfortunately, we have experienced the incompetence of those who should lead the struggle against the mafia and their lack of will.

[Mauro] But after a 6-year investigation, is the mafia still alive and could it threaten Gorbachev's restructuring?

[Gdlyan] More than ever. The mafia is now galloping, and the bloody rebellion in Fergana proves it. Do not forget that Fergana was the fief of Adylov and Usmankhodzhayev. They are both in prison but their people are all still down there.

[Mauro] Are you not afraid?

[Gdlyan] Look, I am afraid for the country's future. However, the Prosecutor's Office once gave me a pistol to defend myself, with three bullets. After a short while they withdrew it, but it was no problem, since I was convinced that those people would always have had one bullet more.

[Mauro] One final question, Judge Gdlyan: Do you still believe in restructuring?

[Gdlyan] If we are still alive we will see, and if we see, then that means that we will still be alive....

Andreyva Article Attacking Perestroyka Cited

AU2707122089 Paris AFP in English
1156 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, July 27 (AFP)—A Soviet academic, who shocked political circles last year by publicly condemning the Soviet reform programme has reentered the fray with a virulent attack on reformist figures and the state of the country.

Nina Andreyva, a sociologist at Leningrad university, caused a sensation in the spring of 1988, by writing a letter, published in the daily "SOVEYTSKAYA ROSSIYA", condemning President Mikhail Gorbachev's economic reform programme. The article was widely published and became a manifesto for conservatives and opponents of reform.

Her latest attack, published in the conservative, Communist Youth monthly "MOLODAYA GVARDIYA", Mrs. Andreyva complains that "anti-socialist forces, at work in our country, helped by revisionist elements, have unfurled at the heart of perestroyka, a process that is similar to the events of Hungary in 1956, and Czechoslovakia in 1968."

Several reformist personalities are on the receiving end of her attacks.

Roy Medvedev, a former dissident during the Brezhnev period, recently elected member of the Soviet parliament and "one of the principal specialists on the history of our country" is denounced for never having "shaken the dust off a box of archives."

Mrs. Andreyva also launched into the head of the historical archives institute, Yuriy Afanasiyev, for his "sensationalising declarations" which have "injured" the "people".

Criticisms of Stalin and "a series of other leaders" are a "screen, behind which forces are getting ready, as is already the case, to attack Lenin, marxist-leninism and the October Revolution," the article said.

"Perestroyka has become all talk and no action," Mrs Andreyva wrote, adding that she receives "an unending stream of letters" from people worried about the course of events in the Soviet union.

The article complained that Popular Fronts and "Democratic Unions" have contributed to the "exacerbation of contact between different nationalities and the rising tide of nationalism."

"Lies, subjectivity, lack of proof and permissiveness" are plaguing Soviet publications.

"Unfortunately," the article concluded, "lack of proof and demagogy have become the visiting cards of a large sector of the press and televised broadcasts aimed at young and old alike.

Sychev Interviewed on Improving Output Quality

LD2607172189 Moscow TASS in English 0825 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 26 TASS—Elaborating and implementing state scientific-technical policy to monitor product quality is the principal task before the USSR state committee for supervising product quality and standards, Valeriy Sychev, chairman of the committee, said in an interview published in the GOVERNMENT HERALD. Therefore, we give priority to work to enhance the competitivity of articles and products, assure a high standard of their safety, reduce spending and see to it that their production is ecologically pure. The Ultimate goal is to make sure that there are only top-quality goods on the domestic market.

Our task is not to remove some shortcomings in quality control but create such a structure and assign such functions to it, which would dramatically expedite movement toward the goal. He favoured, in part, assuring legislative protection of consumer rights.

Sychev emphasised the need for state output quality inspection as an extraordinary measure for those producers who ignore the interests of the state and consumers. But in the longer-term, there wil be no place for state inspection in the output quality control system. It will be lifted from those factories and producers which will assure a stable output of top-quality goods.

V. Petrovskiy Speaks on New Political Thinking

PM0607105589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "The New Thinking Is Not a Doctrine but a Method"]

[Text] A scientific practical debate was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry entitled "New Political Thinking Is the Humanization, Demilitarization, and Democratization of International Relations and the Deideologization of Interstate Relations." Prominent Soviet scientists, journalists, and diplomats took part in it.

In his speech V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, said that in the context of the new thinking demilitarization, humanization, and democratization act as processes introducing general human values into all spheres of relations between states, as spiritual and moral guarantees of the emergent system of a secure world, and as a new quality for the internationalization of dialogue and negotiating mechanisms. It is through the salutary effect of these processes that morality in its general human sense has been established in the practice of our diplomacy. Morality in politicals permits no double standards and political cosmetics. Consistency and responsibility are necessary in words and deeds.

The transformation in the nature of international relations also presupposes a change of diplomatic style. The new style is incompatible with bluff, ultimatums, and threats. It is distinguished by its straightforwardness, honesty, tolerance, and respectful attitude to other people's opinion.

V.F. Petrovskiy stressed that the new thinking in effect signifies the revival of diplomacy. However, it would be a mistake to believe that universal answers can be found once and for all to every question that arises. The new thinking is not a doctrine but a method.

The following people delivered reports: A. Pozdnyakov, chief scientific staffer at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economics and International Relations; V.P. Stupishin, chief advisor to the USSR Foreign Ministry Evaluation and Planning Administration; B.I. Marushkin, senior scientific staffer at the USSR Academy of Sciences Universal History Institute; and A.V. Kozyrev, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry International Organizations Administration. The reports stressed the ever-increasing interdependence of states in the modern world and the trend toward shaping a single civilization based on general human values.

The speech by USSR People's Deputy Academician V.I. Goldanskiy, who raised the question of a scientific base for diplomacy and dwelt in detail on the features of our new style of conducting international affairs, aroused great interests.

The following spoke in the course of the debate: Yu.B. Kashlev, special envoy; V.B. Zhurkin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of the Europe Institute; V.S. Vereshchetin, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute; A.V. Meliksetov, director of the Moscow State University Asia and Africa Institute, and others.

The participants in the debate stressed that the implementation of the ideas of all-embracing international security and a "European home" are organically linked with the consistent application of the principles of the new thinking within the country and with the formation of a democratic rule-of-law state in the USSR.

The examination of the role of the United Nations and other international organizations in developing interstate cooperation was an important area of the debate.

Modern processes in socialist countries, along with our approach to developing countries' problems were analyzed from the standpoints of the new thinking.

Biryukova Ends Visit to Penza Region, Comments
LD1507184589 Moscow TASS in English
1817 GMT 15 Jul 89

[Text] Penza July 15 TASS—Aleksandra Biryukova, alternate member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and Soviet deputy prime minister, ended her three-day visit to the Penza region, the Russian Federation, today.

One of the major events of her trip was her meeting with workers at the Zarya production amalgamation.

"I've never had such meetings before" Biryukova told journalists. "For four hours I was answering questions which showed that workers, like the country's political leaders, have one concern—how to improve the economic and social situation. I regard many of these questions as people's desire to bring the country out of the grave situation."

Biryukova emphasised that the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies had consolidated the process of strengthening the powers of the Soviets and outlined the guidelines of the Soviet internal and external policy. It also confirmed the urgent need to restruct the style and methods of Party work.

The Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and the Soviet Government submitted to the Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet a programme designed to humanize the Soviet economy in a short period of time, Biryukova went on to say. Now that the highest body of state authority has passed the necessary decisions, the most important thing is to implement them, Biryukova said.

During her stay in the Penza region, Biryukova took part in an all-union conference on improving trade servicing of the population.

Biryukova Interviewed on Visit
LD1507215489 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 17 Jul 89

[Excerpts] Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Soviet deputy premier visited Penza Oblast 13-15 July. [passage omitted] Today, an all-union conference was held in Penza, at which urgent steps to improve commercial services to the public were examined. After it ended, Aleksandra Biryukova granted our correspondent S. Inyushkin an interview:

[Begin recording] [Biryukova] We examined issues relating to the fulfillment of the decisions of the July 1988 Central Committee Plenum and of the USSR government decision on the development of the material and technological base, and on improving and raising the standards of service offered to the public by commercial enterprises. This oblast has reasonably good experience. Above all, we have seen this experience in the creation of the material and technological basis of commerce, and in a totally new approach toward providing shops with ready-packaged produce.

It was no mere coincidence that we selected Penza oblast in which to hold this conference. I should like to say that, though I may perhaps not yet have a sufficiently deep understanding of agricultural matters, nevertheless, the increases they have made in milk yields and weight gain, and in recovering additional agricultural products—all this would indicate that the oblast leadership is starting to get very actively involved in plumbing deep-down reserves to boost the output of foodstuffs and consumer goods, and to remove as quickly as possible those acute shortages that exist in this oblast, and indeed throughout the country.

[Inyushkin] Is it then a specific response to the decisions of the congress?

[Biryukova] Yes. Yes. It is a specific response to the decisions of the congress. [end recording] [video shows biryukova visiting an exhibition, talking to people, visiting enterprises, at a conference, and giving her interview]

CPSU's Grachev Discusses Pan-European Process

PM1007102689 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 5 Jul 89 p 9

[Interview with Andrey Grachev, CPSU Central Committee International Department deputy chief, by Giulietto Chiesa in Paris—date not given]

[Excerpt] Paris—[Passage omitted] [Chiesa] What was the significance of Gorbachev's message to the people on Saturday evening?

[Grachev] First, I would like to say that this message is the first of a series. Gorbachev received investiture from the congress and intends to use it. The exceptional terms in which he spoke correspond to an exceptional situation which might result in a crisis.

[Chiesa] You told a French newspaper that any return to the past might spark off a civil war.

[Grachev] Following the election campaign and the Congress of People's Deputies, it is difficult to imagine that the people could give up the end of fear and all that has been achieved. Glasnost is not a faucet which can be turned off at will. I confirm that any such attempt would cause civil war. But I think that it is as unlikely as a nuclear conflict among civilized nations.

[Chiesa] So what was the reason for Gorbachev's grave tone?

[Grachev] It was because he was trying to warn of the danger that uncontrolled national upsurges could stir up Russian nationalism. That would endanger perestroyka because arousing Russian nationalism amounts to arousing conservative forces.

[Chiesa] There has recently been a great deal of talk about a "common European home." But there are doubts in the West. The processes in East Europe are still unstable...

[Grachev] We think that no East European country should have less freedom than the USSR—primarily free elections. And there must be freedom of choice for each nation. In the West people think that the Communists will be kicked out of government. I do not think so. In our country, for instance, things went differently on 26 March. However, there is no single formula for the different situations. Every country is seeking its path toward pluralism. And this is a good thing.

[Chiesa] Will the USSR not hamper that?

[Grachev] We respect the choices made by each country, be it socialist or not. The new way of thinking makes this necessary. As regards the "common home," we are in favor of greater and closer integration of the Western part of the continent. We are only asking that this should not lead to a new phase of opposition to the Eastern part. This is one aspect. There is another. We are proposing to tackle the discussion on the future of relations between these two "halves" to ensure that they cooperate more closely and, in turn, seek ways of integrating. We agree with Mitterrand who is talking of building bridges between the two Europes. Finally, we do not think that this means capitulation by socialism. Many people in the West are looking at this process as one in which East Europe is purely and simply being absorbed by the West or even as a revocation of the Yalta agreements. This is unrealistic for many reasons.

[Chiesa] What about security problems?

[Grachev] Security is part of the pan-European process. If we succeed in eliminating asymmetries in armaments and removing mutual suspicions, we will have made enormous progress.

[Chiesa] But the obstacle of nuclear deterrence remains.

[Grachev] If Vienna proceeds, it will become clear that it is not necessary.

[Chiesa] Yevgeniy Ambartsumov is among the advisers in Paris. He is a brilliant political scientist, among the most outspoken, and he lived up to his reputation this time.

[Grachev] I do not think that Gorbachev will press the debate on military deterrence with Mitterrand, the subject of bilateral cooperation is more important and at the center of these talks. Despite all its suspicion, France realizes that it is lagging behind the Italians and Germans, for instance.

[Chiesa] The USSR has received "special observer" status at the Council of Europe. Do you regard this recognition as adequate?

[Grachev] I am pleased that it applies simultaneously to the Soviet Union, Hungary, and Poland. It means that the West recognizes that these three countries are moving in the direction of reform. Moreover, I think that Europe is unthinkable without Russian culture, and European civilization must be one civilization. But I also think that a further step could be granting this status not only to the USSR but to its European republics—the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, Belorussia, the three Baltic republics, Moldavia, Georgia, and Armenia, which are also part of European culture. This would confirm, among other things, the autonomy and sovereignty of the Soviet republics and would help the transformation of the USSR into a real federation.

[Chiesa] Does this mean that the USSR will allow these experiments to be developed in the countries of the "socialist camp?"

[Grachev] The Brezhnev doctrine is dead, even if its death has not been officially announced in PRAVDA.

[Chiesa] Does this mean that there could be a Warsaw Pact political summit in the not too distant future with Jakes and Honecker sitting alongside a Solidarity premier?

[Grachev] I do not think it will be more difficult for Jakes to sit down at the same table as, let us say, Geremek, than it would be for him to have new discussions with, let us say, Mlynar. Moreover, the fact that the Warsaw Pact's secrets will be shared with other noncommunist parties does not worry me. It will happen to NATO too sooner or later when, let us say, the PCI [Italian Communist Party] enters government in Italy. Everything changes. You have to have an open mind and be ready for innovations.

Economic Expert on EC-CEMA Relations

AU0607110489 Vienna DER STANDARD in German 6 Jul 89 p 4

[Interview with Professor Ivan Ivanov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Minister's State Foreign Economic Commission, by DER STANDARD Correspondent Georg Possaner in Alpbach: "The USSR Is Not So Desperate That It Needs a Marshall Plan"—date not given]

[Text] DER STANDARD: Professor, for a long time the USSR considered the EC as the economic branch of NATO, as a bulwark of capitalism. About 1 year ago, the EC and CEMA mutually recognized one another. What brought about this change of mind?

Ivanov: Our foreign policy is clearer, and new thinking has been initiated. We accept the realities and thus the EC's importance on a European and international level. Moreover, the EC is our most important trading partner. We have promoted the idea of a "common European home," but such a home cannot be built without an economic foundation. This is why today we no longer consider the EC to be NATO's economic branch, but an important part of Europe.

Therefore CEMA and EC signed the joint declaration about a year ago, which has brought about a normalization of their relations. This has provided every country with the right to negotiate trade and cooperation agreements. In the middle of July we will start our first round of talks.

DER STANDARD: The advantages of such an agreement seem to be self-evident for your country, but where is the benefit for the EC?

Ivanov: The advantages are not that clear for us. One will have to wait for the results of the negotiations. Our position on the EC market is not advantageous; moreover, there are export restrictions for our products in terms of quantity. We are not even in an equally strong position. What is certain is that the USSR is the biggest market in Europe and that it is undergoing a reconstruction process. The economic conditions are more favorable for business people in the EC.

DER STANDARD: Where is the biggest problem?

Ivanov: In the territorial clause, namely the inclusion of West Berlin in the agreement. This means that we do not only have to deal with the FRG, but also with France and Great Britain.

DER STANDARD: Only recently Professor Sakharov warned the West not to provide economic support for Gorbachev's reforms because such support would have the opposite effect. What is your opinion on that?

Ivanov: Normally I listen very carefully to what Professor Sakharov says. However, I have my reservations as soon as he talks about political and economic issues.

DER STANDARD: Some people in the West have launched the idea to draw up a second Marshall Plan for the USSR.

Ivanov: Look, the first Marshall Plan was support by a country that is guided by the market economy for the postwar reconstruction of other countries that share the same ideology. Our situation is not so desperate that we need to ask for such one-sided help. What we want from the West is primarily understanding, management know-how, new technologies, and favorable trade and cooperation conditions. We do not want billions in financial support, and we do not want to run into debt such as Brazil or Poland have. There is something else: The fruits of restructuring cannot be imported, they have to come from our own production.

DER STANDARD: When would USSR membership in GATT conceivable for you?

Ivanov: According to our timetable the application could be made in 1991. The precondition for it is that we have done our "homework": New customs tariffs, and replacing both current price systems by a uniform system.

DER STANDARD: By what time do you predict the full convertibility of the ruble?

Ivanov: I think that we will not be able to attain these conditions—stabilizing the financial system, price reform, internal convertibility, and strong industrial exports to support the foreign exchange rate—before the end of the century.

DER STANDARD: Do you think that Austrian EC membership would be beneficial for European East-West economic relations?

Ivanov: Negotiations will not be initiated before 1992. It is not only an economic decision but also a political one, because of your country's special status. This was repeatedly pointed out by our embassy. From a merely economic point of view, your country will follow new paths in order to play the same role as before. When East and West were separated from one another you were the most important bridge. If Europe is now becoming more or less unified, this role might change.

Medvedev Meets With Estonian Workers, Journalists
PM2107091789 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 7 Jul 89 pp 1,3

[Report by ETA correspondents R. Amos, F. Kaazik, and L. Sher: "Seeking Mutual Understanding"]

[Excerpts] V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is continuing his stay in Estonia.

As already reported, Comrade Medvedev met with the leadership of Estonia's Union of Labor Collectives in the afternoon of 5 July. They had a substantive discussion that was of interest to all the participants on pressing economic and political problems. At V.A. Medvedev's request, the leaders of the Estonian Union of Labor Collectives spoke about its activity and their views on topical issues. [passage omitted]

The participants in the meeting also touched on questions of relations between the Estonian Union of Labor Collectives and the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] United Council of Labor Collectives. In this connection V.A. Medvedev stressed that dialogue is needed and that it is very bad if that does not happen.

"It is my firm conviction," he said, "that dialogue is necessary. I see nothing to impede this."

"The key question in the current disagreements," the CPSU Central Committee secretary pointed out, "comes down to combining nations' rights and citizens' rights—the participants in the meeting drew that conclusion. Mutual understanding and compromise must be sought on those questions," V.A. Medvedev said. "National self-determination and national rights must not lead to the violation of general civil, human, and humanist principles. On the contrary. We must seek a formula which proceeds on the basis of the real state of affairs."

At a meeting with representatives of the Tallinn Garrison there was a discussion mainly of questions of servicemen's living conditions.

V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, continued his acquaintance with our republic 6 July. He visited the Estonian Farming and Land Reclamation Research Institute in the morning as well as the "Saku" research model state farm [sovkhoz] and met representatives of the Estonian Union of Farmers. [passage omitted].

Comrade Medvedev pointed out that all forms of ownership must be developed in the countryside. Time will tell which will be more effective. Current systems which are functioning normally must not be artificially destroyed in the current rush to create livestock units and lease farms. The CPSU Central Committee secretary made enquiries at the research institute about the profitability of farming and livestock raising and raised the question of expanding feed production and boosting its effectiveness.

There was also a thorough discussion of environmental protection, the activity of the "Green" movement, and social security for peasants.

V.A. Medvedev was familiarized with experimental fields at the Estonian Farming and Land Reclamation Research Institute where both cereals and potatoes are cultivated along with a promising oilseed crop—rape. He also visited "Esko" farmstead, where Velo Eensalu and his family live and work. The farmer and the CPSU Central Committee secretary had a businesslike conversation about the possibilities of and prospects for individual economic activity.

As the saying goes, V.A. Medvedev's meeting with the republic's journalists passed in a flash. Mutual questions, to which the sides tried to give thorough and exhaustive answers within the time allocated, rained down for 2 hours in the small hall at the House of Journalists. The main topic of conversation was the place and role of the press in the complex sociopolitical situation.

"The press," the CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed, "reflects public opinion, but the latter gets excited, is sometimes aggravated, and may not be quite correctly oriented. I agree with the criticism of the party apparatus' style and methods of work, but doubt must not be cast on the need for the apparatus in general, and a negative meaning should not be imparted to these words. We must rid the press of extremes and bald criticism. It is time for practical action, and the press must promote this. We must emerge from the state of universal criticizing."

The meeting participants drew the attention of the leader of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Commission to the deplorable state of the republic's printing base and to the fact that the volume of information the readers expect has sharply increased while the amount of newsprint has remained unchanged. Journalists' speeches stressed that this is not making it possible to conduct polemics in newspapers on topical questions and analyze many topical problems in detail. TASS and ETA items occupy a great deal of space in newspapers—

these articles are necessary but they result in the newspaper's own material spending weeks and sometimes months in files, and it is certainly impossible to preserve the originality and individuality of every publication.

A special topic was the provision of correct information for readers, listeners, and viewers outside the republic on the processes under way in Estonia. Ideas were voiced of union republic journalists publishing a statewide newspaper in which every republic would have its own page, and of creating republic programs on Central Television and All-Union Radio. It was pointed out that some articles in the central press are unobjective in their depiction of events in Estonia; they allow subjectivity, and sometimes a definite line can be detected in this. But the republic's journalists had to acknowledge that their work also contains many annoying imperfections and even serious blunders, and that the republic press sometimes publishes material that suffers from the same subjectiveness and from extreme assessments that harm the common cause and the development of solidarity among people.

V.A. Medvedev was asked how preparations are going for the CPSU Central Committee plenum on nationalities policy, and whether any document will be published for discussion. Comrade Medvedev reported that intensive and very thorough preparations are under way, for it is a question not of amendments but of radical changes to the nationalities policy. The reasons behind the emergence of our new situation must be analyzed in a sober manner. Of course, the idea of a federation of equal peoples has been distorted, and we must rid ourselves of the veneer of unitarism and eliminate the injustice perpetrated against entire peoples, although the solution of these problems is very complex. The legacy of the unwarranted repressions also has to be reckoned with. But everything must not be reduced to this range of problems alone. A very great deal has changed over the decades: the demographic situation, the degree of economic integration, and so on. It is precisely economic problems, superimposing themselves on ethnic and national problems, which are acquiring particular meaning and are in many respects determining current events in the country. The economy and ecology—which the plenum also cannot bypass—represent the most acute problem. It would be incorrect to expect it to resolve all problems. It is not the task of the CPSU and its Central Committee to resolve specific issues. The plenum is designed to determine a political line, new approaches to federation and to the problems of autonomous units and small nationalities, both those concentrated in a small area and those scattered throughout the country.

Journalists inquired about the reasons for M.S. Gorbachev's televised speech on problems of interethnic relations, which has generated considerable rumors.

V.A. Medvedev replied that this speech was made on the initiative of M.S. Gorbachev himself, since the question of our country's leader making regular appeals to citizens, as happens in many other countries of the world, has arisen on several occasions. It is understandable why it was these problems that were chosen for his first speech—the situation here has reached danger level and people are dying. The second part of the speech was devoted to preliminary constructive approaches in the sphere of nationalities policy.

On the same day the CPSU Central Committee secretary had a meeting with the representatives of the Estonian SSR United Council of Labor Collectives.

In the evening V.A. Medvedev attended a concert at the "Baltika-89" international folk music and dance festival in Tallinn's City Hall.

Further on Secretary Medvedev in Estonia
PM0707124389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Lively Discussion"]

[Text] Tallinn, 5 Jul—V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who is in the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], has had a meeting with representatives of the republic's scientific intelligentsia.

Questions concerning the scientific community were touched upon during an exchange of opinions. The participants in the meeting noted the slow progress toward republic economic accountability and the need for compromise from the center and the republic when working out the fine details of its mechanism. The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee stressed that the economic accountability concept proposed by the Estonian Government is being considered very carefully and amicably.

A great deal of attention was devoted to questions of developing the republics' sovereignty and regulating interethnic relations, and particularly to the language problem and migration. The scientists expressed the desire for a more detailed political appraisal of the 1939 Soviet-German treaty and the historical events connected with it.

The need for greater independence in the work of the republics' academies of sciences and for giving them the right to determine the main areas of research and the structure of their scientific establishments was unanimously noted.

The lively discussion on the processes taking place in Estonian social life was continued at the Tallinn Veneer Furniture Combine, where a meeting was held with the enterprise's workers, specialists, and leaders. The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee surveyed the combine workshops, talked to workers, and took an interest in working conditions and labor remuneration.

In the evening V.A. Medvedev had a meeting with representatives of the union of Estonian labor collectives and servicemen from the Tallinn Garrison.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee laid flowers at the Eternal Flame at the memorial to the fighters for Soviet power.

Ideology Deputy Shares Views on Glasnost
PM0707141189 Paris LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS in French 4 Jul 89 p 6

[Interview with Georgiy Pryakhin, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ideology Department, by Dominique Lagarde; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] [Lagarde] The first sessions of the Congress of People's Deputies gave rise to debates which were sometimes very lively. Do you think that this pluralism of ideas which was expressed could—and should—one day lead to pluralism in the press and, ultimately, party pluralism?

[Pryakhin] We already have pluralism in the press and it is precisely this openness in the press which was largely behind the Congress debates. It is a development which nobody can stop. Moreover, it would be impossible to stop it even if we wished to do so. I think that this process will be speeded up. Pluralism will develop further, particularly within the party. We may witness the emergence of parties within the party in the future. We cannot close our eyes to the existence of various tendencies in the party and I do not rule out the possibility of parties being formed on the basis of these tendencies.

[Lagarde] Do you think that parties might also one day be formed outside the framework of the Communist Party?

[Pryakhin] This cannot be ruled out, especially with regard to the nationalist movements. But I personally think that such a development would create risks and would be likely to aggravate our situation.

[Lagarde] Do you think that the most realistic hypothesis with regard to a possible multiparty development would be the formation of parties on the basis of existing tendencies within the party?

[Pryakhin] It seems to me that this is the most likely hypothesis if we consider the fact that 86 percent of the Congress members are party members, but that most of them are not members of the apparatus and that many were elected when running against party officials. There is therefore a fairly broad range of opinions within the party itself. This makes us think about the most positive way of using this pluralism.

[Lagarde] How can this development be reconciled with the party's monopoly or the rule of democratic centralism, for instance?

[Pryakhin] The sphere of application of the party's monopoly is shrinking more and more. In ministries or enterprises people are less and less happy to see the party interfere in decisions. It is true that this development is causing some anxiety among the most traditionalist elements, but I think that we can overcome these reactions. We are like a ship rounding Cape Horn. It is dangerous, but if the ship is well steered, it can make the passage. And I think that we will make the passage...with your help.

[Lagarde] We have the feeling that perestroyka is sweeping aside some dogmas in the economic sphere too. I am thinking in particular of the introduction of market mechanisms, private cooperatives, the farmers' new status, and joint ventures with foreign companies....

[Pryakhin] There are several ways of viewing communist ideology. Communist ideology, in the true sense of the word, corresponds to what we are now doing. Take the cooperatives for instance. Did Lenin not call the socialist system the system of "civilized cooperators?" After Lenin, our ideology gradually became doctrinaire. We now need flexibility. We are accustomed to a very centralized system based on command and execution. We must rehabilitate initiative. Ideology must not interfere in economic affairs. In particular, there is an urgent need to remove the diktat of ideology in agriculture, because it is responsible for great damage in that sphere. This system has turned our peasants into agents without initiative. They must resume the initiative and the state must only intervene at a later stage, by fiscal measures, as it does in France.

[Lagarde] So, ownership of the means of production does not strike you as incompatible with communism?

[Pryakhin] No. Pluralism must also be developed in the sphere of ownership. We recognize private ownership, cooperative ownership, and mixed ownership, along with state ownership. We believe that it is by enabling all these forms of ownership to coexist that we will be able to increase our efficiency.

[Lagarde] So, will you do so with a mixed economy?

[Pryakhin] Certainly. But this economy must not accept exploitation. For instance, those who are working in cooperatives should not have wages which are lower than those they would have in a state enterprise. They can have more, but not less. I am not an economist, but I note that results were not good with centralism. The market may be a dangerous sea, but we must learn to swim in that sea. We cannot surround ourselves with barriers against the outside world.

[Lagarde] There is another sphere in which communist ideology is in difficulty and that is international relations. Lenin said: "It is us or them," and for a long time international relations have been seen in the USSR essentially from the angle of the ideological struggle. This theme has now disappeared from official statements....

[Pryakhin] I have a great deal of respect for Lenin, who had a brilliant mind, but there is nobody who has made no mistakes, and there are no ideas which do not have to change. It is individualism which is the most important thing in the world today, whereas in the past society dominated the individual. Recognizing the individual means recognizing the differences and riches of this world. Fundamentally, perestroyka is the rehabilitation of the individual. And if any elements of our ideological past do not correspond to today's requirements, we must reread Lenin.

Following the 20th congress, we spoke of peaceful coexistence and the ideological struggle. We now recognize and respect ideological differences. In the communist world, we respect the freedom of choice of different countries. Outside it, we are trying to develop our relations with ideologically different countries.

[Lagarde] So, this is more a superpower's policy than an ideological policy?

[Pryakhin] Yes, you could say that. The role of ideology in our country has been reduced and will be reduced further, mainly in the economic sphere and the sphere of foreign relations.

[Lagarde] In the USSR over recent years, we have witnessed many rehabilitations of former prominent figures, and at the same time certain points in history ceased to be taboo subjects. Following this great upheaval, what relationship do young people and citizens now have with their past?

[Pryakhin] The lack of any reference point is a problem. Some people see these criticisms of the past as a desire to deny our history; they think that our history cannot be so bad. We are living through a crisis phase, but I think that we need this phase.

[Lagarde] Still on the subject of this thinking about the past, do you think that Lenin is the last taboo?

[Pryakhin] This taboo is being lifted too. For instance, in its latest issue the magazine OKTYABR publishes a text by a writer who was banned in the fifties and has now been rehabilitated—a text which is very critical of Lenin. It upholds the theory that it is Lenin who was responsible for the establishment of dictatorship in the USSR and states that without Lenin there would have been no Stalin. We are also going to publish Solzhenitsyn, as you know. However, I do not agree with those who would like to make Lenin responsible for all the mistakes made by Stalin and Trotskiy. I do not think that criticism of Lenin could be like criticism of Stalin. What we must make is an effort at openness. Lenin should not be regarded as an icon. He made mistakes in his analysis, for instance in predicting the disappearance of capitalism. He was a man who could also be wrong. After all, the only people who never make mistakes are the people who do nothing.

[Lagarde] Mikhail Gorbachev recently issued a warning in which he seemed to view the nationalities' movements and the ethnic troubles are the greatest danger for the USSR at present. Is this your view?

[Pryakhin] I think that it is indeed the main threat to glasnost and perestroyka. The mixture of peoples and races creates an explosive situation.

[Lagarde] How do you explain this upsurge of nationalism?

[Pryakhin] Some people see these events as a result of perestroyka and would like to use them as an argument against it. But the malaise existed before, even if it was hidden. It is like a seed which is in the ground and shoots up after rain. Perestroyka is the rain.

We certainly did not correctly assess the role of religion and social realities in these republics. In particular, we underestimated the influence of Muslim traditions. You must also realize that we do not have any tradition of protest and this means that a demonstration is immediately seen as extremist in our country. Rather than dwelling on old wounds, I think we should now be concerned with the future, in other words with these peoples' economic and cultural development. Moreover, not everything is negative in the nationalist movements. We must certainly rethink relations among the nationalities in the USSR. But this is not easy.

[Lagarde] With regard to the threats which might hang over developments in the USSR, do you think that a Chinese-style situation could exist?

[Pryakhin] No, I think that a Chinese-style situation is impossible. China's tragedy is that it opened up economically without introducing political reforms. We are doing both at the same time.

[Lagarde] Finally, is your plan for society still a communist plan?

[Pryakhin] Communism is an attractive idea, but I think it is a remote ideal. It is the ideal of a democratic, rich, and happy society. But communism must not be imposed by force. I am opposed to aggressive idealism. Having said that, I do not think that our current aspirations are outside the framework of Marxism-Leninism. However, Marxism-Leninism must not be regarded as a fixed dogma but as a theory which is capable of developing.

Chebrikov Attends Prosecutor's Office Collegium

LD2007190489 Moscow TASS in English 1608 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 20 TASS—The fulfilment of the main principle of a law-governed state—the supremacy of law in all the spheres of life—cannot be ensured until an effective struggle against crime is organised in the country, Aleksandr Sukharev, USSR prosecutor-general, said today at an enlarged collegium of the USSR prosecutor's office.

He pointed out that at present statistics in this sphere are far from encouraging. For the first time in 20 years over a million crimes were committed in the USSR in the first half of the year—32 per cent up against a similar period of 1988. The number of grave crimes increased by almost 40 per cent to reach 170,000. The number of crimes committed for mercenary purposes is also growing. Sukharev pointed to the stable fusing of groups of general criminal orientation with those committing crimes in the sphere of economy. The prosecutor-general also said that 18,000 members of youth groups had been registered last year who had committed some 2,000 crimes.

"We were not quite ready for such a sharp turn towards the humanisation of criminal policy. Preventive work of the prosecutor's office is perceptibly lagging behind modern requirements. Previously from 60 to 70 per cent of convicted persons were sentenced to imprisonment. Now the figure has been reduced by half. At least half of those who would have been sent to correctional labour institutions are now at large. The courts often display undue liberalism for fear of looking 'undemocratic', even with regard to recidivists. [quotation marks as received]

In these conditions, Sukharev continued, the problem of improving procuratorial supervision is becoming more acute than ever. Its new concept is now being developed. Procuratorial supervision should be spread to the whole system of relations in the state. With this in view it is necessary, in the first place, to improve the legislation and to set things in order in this diversified and imperfect sphere. Last year 4,500 legislative acts, 12,000 pieces of subordinate legislation and 70,000 administrative acts were abrogated in the USSR following the reports of public prosecutors. A reform of the investigating apparatus is being actively discussed.

According to Sukharev, the activities of prosecutor's offices are aimed at promoting the implementation of the economic reform, upholding constitutional rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens and protecting them from any manifestations of arbitrariness, administrative and bureaucratic distortions.

Speaking about the problem of inter-ethnic relations, the USSR prosecutor-general stressed that in this sphere it was necessary to bring the whole weight of the law to bear on those who deliberately kindle inter-ethnic strife, to resolutely oppose any manifestations of nationalism and extremism.

Viktor Chebrikov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, attended the collegium of the USSR public prosecutor's office.

Silayev Remarks on Managerial Training

LD0507055289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 4 July broadcasts an interview with Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, by Lyudmila Semina. The date and place of the interview are not given.

In the interview, Silayev describes his new program for making enterprises more successful and measures to boost production of agricultural machinery. Semina asks Silayev for his view of the issue of the rejuvenation of cadres. Silayev replies:

"Perhaps you know that during Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to the FRG, several documents were signed. And, among the most important was the agreement on training managers. Three thousand people will be trained in the FRG's best centers, using a very serious syllabus.

"Machine builders will account for at least half of the trainees. The selection is very strict. Candidates must not be over 35; therefore, their service record will not be very long. There are very interesting tests which reveal ability for quick and profound thinking and for making original decisions. Such cadres are already being trained. Five groups of 16 trainees each have already completed the course; they are young directors who have worked for 2 or 3 years.

"We think this is right. This is part of the implementation of the agreement with the FRG. In the future, we plan to invite engineers from institutes and appoint them immediately to serious posts. This is included in our program."

Maslyukov Addresses Council of Ministers Academy

PM0607142789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Cadres of Restructuring"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers Academy of the National Economy held its 10th graduation ceremony in Moscow on 30 June.

The assembly was addressed by Yu.D. Maslyukov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee.

Congratulating the students on their graduation from the Academy and wishing them success in their careers, the keynote speaker observed that they are returning to work in a situation of exceptional social activity in the country. It is difficult to overestimate cadres' managerial role, particularly at a time when perestroyka of the whole national economy is under way in the country and considerable structural changes are taking place within the economy toward giving it the broadest social orientation. It was stressed that the national economy today needs energetic and competent production leaders.

Zaykov Meets Bio-Organic Institute Scientists

LD0607230689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Zaykov today met with scientists of the Institute of Bio-organic Chemistry of the USSR Academy of Sciences, where basic research connected with the chemical study of living material, and the development of physico-chemical biology and biotechnology, is carried out. Comrade Zaykov viewed the laboratories and the recently opened experimental production facility, equipped with modern equipment. A report on Comrade Zaykov's visit to the Institute of Bio-organic Chemistry will be published in the press.

Gromyko Accorded Traditional Burial Honors

18001339 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 27, 8-14 Jul 89 p 8

[Text] **On what premise does the Soviet leadership proceed when resolving the question of the burial place of any particular figure? A.A. Gromyko was for 3 years the head of state and was for a long time a member of the Politburo and was USSR foreign minister for 30 years. Why has it been decided to bury him in the Novodevichye Cemetery and not in the Kremlin wall?**

These questions, asked by foreign correspondents at a news conference in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, are answered by Yu. Gremitskikh, first deputy chief of the Information Administration.

Yu. Gremitskikh pointed out that there are certain established traditions and a set procedure. The country's present leadership is not making any changes or innovations on this plane. A. Gromyko was a high ranking state figure but in recent times he was a pensioner. Therefore the burial site chosen is the Novodevichye Cemetery (in Moscow—editor's note). Naturally, there will be an official ceremony, a guard of honor and so forth.

Burial in the Novodevichye Cemetery is most honorable, Yu. Gremitskikh noted. The family of the deceased gratefully accepted the suggestion. Incidentally, it is easier to visit a burial site in the Novodevichye Cemetery than in the Kremlin wall.

Il-62 Lands Safely Without Nose Cone in Moscow

LD2007083989 Moscow TASS in English 0754 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 20 TASS—An IL-62 passenger plane landed at Moscow's Sheremetyevo Airport last Tuesday without a nose cone, the newspaper KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reveals today.

The plane carried remaining members of the Soviet delegation which participated in the world festival of youth and students in Pyongyang. Soon after take-off in the capital of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the plane was surrounded by dense clouds and then caught up in a powerful turbulence.

Simultaneously, the plane's radar failed and the nose cone was torn off, apparently, because lightning had hit the aircraft. The plane could not return to Pyongyang without the radar, whereas Moscow was nine hours of flight away. The crew commander decided to fly to Moscow.

Weather conditions were reported to the crew from air traffic control stations on land. The flight over China was practically blind.

The most difficult part of the flight was the landing as the lack of the cone was particularly felt at low altitudes. At one moment, the instruments malfuncioned, but still the IL-62 made a perfect landing.

Medical Official Gives AIDS Statistics

LD2107141989 Moscow TASS in English 1410 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 21 TASS—There are 718 acquired immune deficiency syndrome virus carriers (292 Soviet nationals and 426 foreigners) and 13 AIDS cases (ten Soviets and three foreigners) in the USSR today, according to Valentin Pokrovskiy, president of the Soviet Academy of Medical Sciences.

He told TASS correspondent Igor Peskov that the situation is extremely alarming and demands urgent action to prevent the spread of the deadly disease.

He said his academy is conducting an extensive explanatory campaign, equipping the nation's medical centers with required diagnosis and therapeutic equipment, and setting up hospitals for AIDS victims.

Pokrovskiy singled out the problem of infection through inadequate medical equipment as fairly acute in the Soviet Union where such cases have been registered in the cities of Elista, Volgograd and Rostov-on-Don.

"We have an intolerably high percentage of cases of the AIDS virus being transferred via blood during surgery," he said.

"Of the total number of carriers, some 40 per cent have contracted the virus in this way," Pokrovskiy added, saying that hard currency is being allocated to urgently import equipment for making disposable syringes, droppers, blood storage containers and catheters.

"The behaviour of some people towards AIDS patients is sometimes hostile and aggressive," Pokrovskiy said.

"This leads to a very dangerous situation: People developing the symptoms of the disease conceal this from those around them and even from doctors and thereby increase the risk of the disease spreading," he said.

Development of Cooperative Sector Viewed

LD1207163389 Moscow TASS in English 1558 GMT 12 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 12 TASS—Academician Vladimir Tikhonov has described the development of the cooperative sector as one direction to democratise the Soviet economy.

The chairman of the Alliance of United Cooperatives, founded in July, and academician of the All-Union Agricultural Academy today spoke at a Soviet Foreign Ministry briefing devoted to the results of the Alliance's founding congress which united the republican and sectoral cooperative associations.

Tikhonov stressed that as cooperation is gaining in strength, it is creating propitious conditions for the development of the market and market relations in the Soviet economy.

The main task of the alliance is to protect cooperatives' social rights and property interests. In the process of its realisation we will also work to foster effective interaction between cooperatives and the state sector of the economy. It can be carried out in a great diversity of forms, for instance, in the form of state orders placed with cooperatives on the basis of contractual relations.

In the process, priority will be given to the development of those sectors and areas of the economy, the shortage in whose output is most severe. These are not only the production of consumer goods but also of machinery for individual peasant farms and agricultural cooperatives, and also construction and farm output processing.

Artem Tarasov, deputy chairman of the Alliance, noted in his speech that the cooperative sector of the economy has ample opportunities for boosting international cooperation.

There were over 200,000 cooperatives in the USSR in April 1989 and their number is growing by seven to eight thousand each month. This sector of the Soviet economy now employs about two million people. The processes developing here are contradictory in many respects and the Alliance of United Cooperatives has to accomplish a dedicated work to use to the maximum cooperatives' positive potential as well as to remove the reasons behind a negative attitude to it by part of the country's populace.

Dual-Use Chemical Export Controls Enacted

18070705 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 18 Jul 89 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Dual-Use Chemicals"]

[Text] In the development of the Soviet Union's policy in the field of nonproliferation of chemical weapons, on 3 July 1989 the USSR Council of Ministers promulgated Decree No 544, confirming the Provisions on the Export of Chemicals for chemicals that are themselves harmless but can be used to produce chemical weapons (dual-use chemicals). Two lists of such chemicals are attached as appendices to the Provisions.

Operations involving the export of chemicals on list No 1 are permitted by the USSR Ministry of the Chemical and Petroleum Refining Industry Soyuzkhimeksport foreign trade organization. The export of chemicals on list No 2 may be carried on by enterprises, associations and production cooperatives and other Soviet organizations in accordance with the USSR Council of Ministers decree No 203 dated 7 March 1989 on licenses issued by the USSR Ministry of the Chemical and Petroleum Refining Industry.

Questions on exports of dual-use chemicals applications should be addressed to the USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Refining Industry Soyuzkhimeksport.

Export Controls Placed on Household Items

LD1507165689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 15 Jul 89

[Text] The summer tourist season is at its height, as you know. Every day 40 foreign-bound trains and over 1,000 motor vehicles pass through Brest alone. The increasing openness of our society and the simplification of exit formalities are more and more promoting contacts between people. At the same time, however, as our correspondent reports from Brest, some fellow countrymen, and some guests too, not infrequently turn their foreign ties into unconcealed tourism in kind. There has recently been evidence, for instance, of mass export abroad of most simple, cheap goods in everyday demand. Taking account of this, from 15 July an addendum to the regulations on transportation of goods across the Soviet border has come into force. Given the shortage on the domestic market, export of building materials, household linen and linen fabric, and sets of tableware, among other things is forbidden. tightening up of border control is a compulsory measure similar to the previous ban on color televisions, which is also temporary.

The editorial board was informed of this in the country's main customs administration.

'Solemn Meeting' Marks Metallurgists' Day

18230063 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 16 Jul 89 p 1

[TASS report: "Solemn Meeting"]

[Text] Our country occupies first place in the world in the production of metal. However, perestroyka has removed the hypnosis of large numbers and a whole range of serious problems have been uncovered in this area. The enterprises' collectives are resolving them by transferring to khozraschet and by introducing the newest technology and equipment. The participants in a solemn meeting, marking Metallurgists' Day, discussed this. The meeting was held in Moscow on 14 July.

The Minister of the USSR Metallurgy Industry S.V. Kolpakov presented a report.

Meeting participants included first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers L.A. Voronin, responsible workers of the CPSU Central Committee, heads of a number of ministries and departments, scientists, leading production workers, and representatives of the capital's public.

Journal Sets Up Council on Interethnic Relations

LD2107232789 Moscow TASS in English 2246 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 22 TASS—A council set up at Moscow's journal DRUZHBA NARODOV (FRIENDSHIP AMONG THE PEOPLES) will promote solutions to the problems of relationships among the peoples of the Soviet Union.

On the council are prominent writers, scientists, and cultural figures of various nationalities.

A TASS correspondent was told on Friday [21 July] that the new public organisation would invite people's deputies of the USSR and representatives of all sections of the population that seek to contribute to the strengthening of relations between the peoples of the Soviet Union to the council's meetings.

Sergey Baruzdin, chairman of the council and secretary of the board of the Soviet Writers' Union, is of the opinion that respect for all the peoples inhabiting the Soviet Union is essential in tackling all ethnic problems, of which quite a lot have accumulated in the country.

Matters concerning culture, literature, and language, which are so emotionally discussed now in various regions of the country, are directly dependent on politics, economics and a fair solution to legal and social problems, Baruzdin told TASS.

Now that a refinement of the constitution of the USSR is being started in the country, this work should also apply to the constitutions of all republics. It is important accurately and in a well-considered way to determine the exact functions of the Russian language as the language of inter-ethnic contacts throughout the country's territory and at the same time the rights and functions of the native languages of all peoples of the USSR.

The DRUZHBA NARODOV journal which has a circulation of more than one million copies will carry articles about the activities of the council.

The council has instituted a special prize which will be awarded to those who will make a marked contribution to the strengthening of friendship and mutual understanding among the peoples of the USSR.

Censorship of Space Encyclopedia Discussed

OW2107064289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 20 Jul 89

[From the "120 Minutes" program presented by Sergey Slipchenko and Tatyana Vedeneyeva]

[Text] [Slipchenko] In our international review today we already have mentioned that practically all of mankind is celebrating the 20th anniversary of man's first steps on the moon. I also cannot ignore this topic on this day. U.S. President Bush made a lengthy speech at a gathering marking this occasion today. He said that space is not our fantasy, but our fate, and added that despite setbacks the United States was, is, and will be a space power.

Today I would like to discuss this topic from a different angle. I would like to show you this book published in 1981. It is a unique encyclopedia of cosmonautics. It was published in France, Great Britain, and many other countries. [Video shows Slipchenko holding up the French edition with the title "ENCYCLOPEDIE VISUELLE DE L'EXPLORATION DE L'ESPACE" on the cover]. It also was published here, which is most interesting. The book was published in the Soviet Union in Russian but with several cuts and in a very limited edition.

In particular, there are foldouts in the book that show all the existing space ships and vehicles in existence in the world today. Here are all the existing rockets, including all Soviet, American, and British ones and those of all other countries. [video shows Slipchenko demonstrating the foldout] Now, the Soviet edition of this book, published with the same foldout, has excluded one single rocket. You can see it here; it is alongside and similar in size to the Saturn-5 rocket, the rocket that carried the U.S. astronauts to the moon. The carrier rocket that you see here is called the Super Launcher [preceding two words in English], or super rocket, which was produced in 1969. This foldout was published in the Soviet edition without, however, including this rocket. It is a Soviet carrier rocket, a Soviet super rocket that was built here

specifically for the moon program. A Soviet man also was to have landed on the moon, with the aid of this Soviet rocket, but this lunar program was shut down subsequently.

I am almost certain that today I am the first person to announce this fact. Two other things are also missing from the Soviet edition of this book. One is a chapter called Military Space. [Slipchenko opens the book and video shows photo illustrations] This chapter includes photographs of military satellites and the ASAT [Anti-satellite] system, which is being developed abroad to combat satellites. This chapter also contains a fairly frank discussion of all the work that is being carried out in the sphere of military space. Military space, in fact, were words heard in the Soviet Union for the first time only at the Congress of People's Deputies.

The most paradoxical and, in my opinion, the most surprising cut that was made in the Soviet edition was in the chapter devoted to all the planet's cosmodromes. The Japanese, French, and American cosmodromes are among those shown in the book. You also can see the plan of the Baykonur cosmodrome. This detailed plan, with all the launch pads, Leninsk City—here you see Leninsk City and here is the launch pad from which the first man went into space, and the launch pad for the "Proton" carrier rocket from which Soviet stations are launched into space—was prepared with the aid of spy satellites. [video shows Slipchenko pointing to maps in the encyclopedia] Similar plans of other Soviet cosmodromes are shown here. Here is the Kapustin Yar cosmodrome near Volgograd. It is shown here in a fairly detailed way with the aerodrome, cities, launch pads, roads, and electric power lines, while on this page the cosmodrome called North [preceding word in English] or the Northern cosmodrome is shown. This is the Plisetsk cosmodrome from which we also reported this year. We previously carried reports on launches in the International Intersputnik program.

So, the plans of Soviet cosmodromes have been removed in the Soviet edition of this book. Here an interesting questions arises: Is this a military secret? No. Was this a secret to the rest of the world? No. It was published in many languages throughout the world, but not in the Soviet Union. But I consider Soviet cosmonautics to be a special topic. I know that we will return to this topic again so that we no longer will have such odd situations when such great programs for mankind—as the program for landing a man on the moon is—are brought to our attention later, when they are closed down for whatever reasons. We will return to this topic again.

Publication of Solzhenitsyn Works Planned

PM2107145689 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 29, 16 Jul 89 p 13

[Unattributed interview with NOVVY MIR chief editor Sergey Zalygin: "We'll Start by Publishing Archipelago—Such Is Its Author's Will"—date, place not given]

[Text] MN: We already know the Secretariat's decision. Did you have jitters going attending it?

S.Z.: Not at all. I never have jitters when I'm absolutely clear on how I'm going to act. In this case I was only supposed to explain what NOVYY MIR did and is doing to give Solzhenitsyn back to Soviet readers. This had to happen sooner or later. The later the worse, of course.

MN: The Secretariat of the Union of Soviet Writers is made up of different people, but they were unanimous on this issue.

S.S.: Yes. There was complete unanimity. Not a single voice against. The issue could not be put off any longer. Travelling abroad and in this country, you happen to talk to three-four media reporters. They all ask the same questions: when will Solzhenitsyn's works be published in his own country? Novyy Mir announced publications shortly.

MN: Is it hard to own up to your own mistakes?

S.Z.: It's hard to own up to big mistakes. Solzhenitsyn is a phenomenon. His life alone makes him an exceptional person. He went through all the ordeals imaginable: war, prison, grave illness, exile. He went through all that. Those whose lives have been uneventful, who weren't in the war, who weren't convicted, who didn't have to seek shelter in other people's homes, may simply find it impossible to understand him. His biography and his talent (his being a genius, perhaps) are such that he was able to see the sense of things in the way we are only beginning to today.

MN: And we are only just starting to realize what we have lost.

S.Z.: The author's life, after he was torn from his native land, failed to confirm the somber forecasts. Solzhenitsyn has not become a politician, he didn't start gathering around him opposition force. He isn't a publisher of a political newspaper, he just has his own works.

MN: Some people who used to attack the author so viciously and with such a zeal probably feel awkward.

S.Z.: I wouldn't think of them now. Many of them really did not know what they were doing. Such was their mental horizon, their ideology. If there are still people who are "against", this leaves me cool. Let them be.

The decision to reinstate Solzhenitsyn as a member of the Union is the most meaningful and positive act on its part in recent times. Now we can have some self-respect. This is something that can really consolidate authors and all cultural figures.

MN: You are going to start with publication of "The GULAG Archipelago". Why?

S.Z.: Such is the will of the author. He repeatedly stated: I want to be published back home, but I want The GULAG Archipelago to be published first. If it were not

for this condition, the Soviet public could have started to read Solzhenitsn as early as last year, in Novyy Mir. But such, I repeat, is the writer's will, both legal and moral. "Archipelago" has played a special role in his life, it was the cause of his leaving his country. Now it's time for the author to play his role as regards this book. This is logical.

There have been many memoirs, documents and stories pubished of late which probe into the topic of repressions in the country's history. The topic is emotional. I think the publication of "Archipelago" is going to help society make some progress in understanding the road covered.

MN: "NOVYY MIR" is going to publish "Archipelago" in an abridged form?

S.Z.: Solzhenitsn didn't insist that the book be published in full—it is enormous. He personally named the chapters he would like to see published first of all. On agreement with the author, we publish approximately one-third of the book so that our readers could get a general idea. There will be no cuts of actual chapters. I ought to add that the athor had no access to any of the archives and documents he needed. Preparing the text for publication, the editors tried to correct the inaccuracies in the manuscript. There aren't very many in fact.

MN: It has been reported that Solzhenitsyn asked Vadim Borisov of "NOVYY MIR" to handle matters concerning publication of his works.

S.Z.: Yes, by honouring this requirement, I think, we would avoid mistakes and any arbitrariness on the part of the publisher, and the copyright would be ensured against violation. I may add that natural interest in the author's books could cause a stir and some might try to prove that they have a special relation with the popular figure. I have some grounds for such fears. I hope that publishers and journalists show reserve and tact in this matter.

MN: Who is Vadim Borisov?

S.Z.: He is one of the staff, deputy head of the fiction department. Solzhenitsyn must have dealt with him in the past and trusts him. As Editor-in-Chief, I trust him too.

MN: What will follow "Archipelago"?

S.Z: We are hoping that 1990 will be a Solzhenitsyn year: of sorts. NOVYY MIR is preparing to publish the novel The First Circle and the short novel Cancer Ward, and some of the author's shorter works. We are planning to publish a collection of Solzhenitsn's works in our supplement. It won't be a full collection but will be representative enough. The session of the Secretariat we mentioned earlier agreed that Sovetskiy Pisatel Publishers would publish The GULAG Archipelago in full.

MN: Does Solzhenitsyn know about the Secretariat's decision?

S.Z.: I think so. The secretariat held an open meeting.

MN: Would the author want to visit the USSR?

S.Z.: I don't know. Our corrspondence was strictly business like. We have different standpoints on many issues. My respect for him is all the greater for that. I have always been amazed at his being absolutely uncompromising. All differences of views should be cast aside when we speak about the talents of Solzhenitsyn, Lyubimov, Rostropovich. The fact that they left the country is very unfortunate for the country and, perhaps, for them, but I know that for a person like Solzhenitsyn, no longer young and with set habits, it is hard to change lifestyle. But I don't want to sound like the executor of his will. I have no cause to do that. Solzhenitsyn is an absolutely independent person.

Anyway, if I could see him here in our office, it would be a great event both for me and, I think, for all the staff.

I dearly wish this would happen.

Paper To Carry Biographies of New Ministers

LD2007020189 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 19 Jul 89

[Text] [Announcer] The Soviet Parliament has completed debates on forming a new cabinet. Through television coverage of the debates the Soviet people had the opportunity to learn and assess programs of various candidates. (?The day) when the newly appointed ministers have got down to work the question is what will be the level of openness in the activity of the new government? Isn't there a danger that the current openness will later diminish? Our reporter, (Aleksandr Kuryakov), has met with an official of the Information Department of the Soviet Government, (Yuriy Tinkov).

[Begin (Tinkov) recording in Russian fading into English translation] Before, cabinet members in this country operated behind closed doors. It was a rare occasion when a minister appeared in front of a television camera. Now that the activity of ministers is being openly and widely discussed from all points of view the ministers themselves are also changing their attitude toward the public opinion, for one towards the mass media. Naturally, in the near future this is bound to affect the style of their work. Earlier they were not always ready to have a talk with the journalists but today one may expect they will be interested in such contacts. [end recording]

[Announcer] The Information Department of the Soviet Government publishes the newspaper GOVERNMENT NEWS. And the latest newspaper said it's next issue will be delayed and will appear in line with a special schedule. Can you comment on this?

[Begin (Tinkov) recording in Russian fading into English translation] Indeed, the next issue will appear later than usual, this time not through the newspaper's fault. The issue is to contain information about the new government with short biographies and interviews with each member. So far we have no reference books containing the full composition of the government with biographies of its members and other vital information. [end recording]

New Church To Be Constructed in Lithuania

PM0607090389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by unnamed TASS correspondents: "At the Request of Believers"]

[Text] Two reports have been filed from Vilnius and Nalchik by TASS correspondents. A new Roman Catholic church is to be built in the Lithuanian capital. What will it be like architecturally? The answer to that question will be given by an exhibition of designs submitted in competition. Fifty design groups are taking part in the competition, which has been launched by the republic Union of Architects and the Curia of the Vilnius Archdiocese.

The new church will be the first to be built in Vilnius since World War II.

Another new religious building will appear in the capital of the Kabardino-Balkar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. The Nalchik City Soviet Executive Committee has acceded to the request of the local Islamic community and authorized the building of a mosque. The autonomous republic's indigenous population regards this as a legitimate act of restoration of social justice to Muslim believers.

The first mosque in the autonomous republic's capital, whose construction will be funded by donations from the Muslim community, will be not just a place of worship but a community center too. Thirteen religious associations registered in the republic have also received permission to build mosques.

From the Editorial Office: We are informed by the USSR Council of Ministers Council for Religious Affairs that in the last 18 months 1,715 religious buildings have been placed at the disposal of religious associations. Permission has been granted to build 229 new religious buildings. Two hundred and fifty-seven buildings will be reequipped for the purposes of prayer and the holding of other religious ceremonies.

Collectivization in Lithuania Reproached

LD1707133289 Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian 7 Apr 89 p 2

[Article by Liudas Truska, entitled "Thus, Collectivization Was Put Into Effect..." under the rubric "From Recent Past"]

[Excerpts] We must admit, in all honesty, we have been portraying Stalin's collectivization very one-sidedly; we have extolled it throughout, concealing its rough distortion, or total disregard, even, of V. Lenin's cooperation principles.

Writers have avoided the subject of collectivization. Throughout the entire rural literature of that 40-year period, there did not appear a single significant work, concerning this most decisive turn in our village history. Even, Jonas Avyzius, patriarch of rural themology, who, in his works, has described almost every aspect of the Lithuanian village, has circumvented the most important period—1948-51, and only began to fill in the gap, after the onset of restructuring.

Conditions, for collectivization of agriculture, were especially unfavorable, in Lithuania. Contrary to the situation in Russia, there existed no rural community here, farmers lived on individual farms. Thus, Lithuanian farmers were characterized by individuality and a strong sense of private ownership. Since Stalin's collectivization had already been compromised in Russia and the word, "kolkhozes" [collective farms] was regarded, in Lithuania, as synonymous with rights' deprivation, poverty, and even, hunger. Stalin's administration, however, was marked by its total disregard for local social, economic, cultural and psychological characteristics. Russian farmers, who had preserved their rural community traditions, small Polar North and Central Asian nations, with a patriarchal social system, and Baltic farmers, with an intensive farming tradition—were treated as if they had all been cast from the same mold.

The course of forced collectivization, in Lithuania, was already apparent from the end of 1940, and became especially evident in the spring of 1941.

Following the Great Fatherland War, collectivization in the Baltic republics was postponed for several years. The first Decree, by the All-Union Communist Party Central Committee, "Concerning Kolhoz Construction in the Soviet Socialist Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia," was passed on 21 May 1947. It recommended restraint, cautioned against becoming carried away by excessively grand-scale undertakings, and urged observance of the priciple of voluntarism.... References to farmers' voluntarism were also made in other official documents, as well as in "Exemplary Agricultural Artel Statutes." In truth, however, the Leninist principle of farmer voluntarism, was merely a demogogic phrase on the lips of Stalin's administration. First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, A. Snieckus, in vain, tried to convince G. Malenkov, secretary at the time, of the All-Union Communist Party (b) [as rendered in text] Central Committee, Deputy Chief of the USSR Council of Ministers, Stalin's right hand, in fact, that there should be no haste in establishing kolkhozes, in Lithuania.

Following the conclusion of the war, first collective farms were established in the republic, in 1947; massive collectivization took place in 1949.

Perhaps the best means of breaking the farmers' will and herding them into kolkhozes, were increases in taxation and grain deliveries to the state; failure to meet them resulted in—loss of ownership.

In 1948 land taxes were increased by half, while for the small farmers, they were even doubled. Grain deliveries were also increased. In 1947 the ownership of one cow, was assessed to yield an average of 290 kg of milk, but in 1949 this was raised to 438 kg. Grain, meat and egg requisitions were increased by 20-50 percent. Concurrently, farmer income decreased considerably after 14 December, 1947 due to currency reform and a drop in market prices, equivalent to three times lower for chicken, two times, for geese, while grain, the most important product, was priced ten times lower.

For this reason, in 1948, farmers paid only 66 percent of their cash taxes. Agricultural taxes were raised again in 1949, with an average increase of 42 percent, while the small landowners' taxes were even increased 4-5 times more. In 1949, there were 30,000 debtors, listed for restraint of property, for non-payment of taxes, alone. Twelve thousand were turned over to the courts; 2,500 paid their debts through property confiscation, while 550 farmers were sentenced to prison.

Such conditions, in rural areas, led to a breaking point, in 1949. At the beginning of the year, four percent of the farmers were in kolhozes, while, by the year's end, that number reached 62 percent. Thus, more than half of Lithuania's farmers were collectivized in one year.

By 1950, single farmers were in the minority. In order to hasten their "decision," agricultural taxes were almost tripled, in August of 1950. Grain deliveries to the state were greatly increased, especially for the small farmers. Why? Because the "large land-holders" were already in the kolkhozes. In October of 1950, the average size of an individual farm amounted to 3.7 hectares tilling soil and 1.5 percent meadowlands.

The kulak problem was of great importance in Lithuania, just as it had been in the entire Soviet Union.

According to Lenin, kulaks are "capitalistic agricultural enterprisers, usually farmers, employing several workers..." [passage omitted] It was noteworthy that V. Lenin did not equate the use of hired labor, with the the mark of a kulak. According to him, every third, or even every other medium-sized farmer, hires workers (locally).

In 1940, there were, in Lithuania, over 29,000 farms of 30 hectares, or more (mostly capitalistic). This type could be found also among the smaller farms, especially among those in the 20-40 hectare range. Just before the onset of Soviet land reform, 26,400 thousand farmers employed two, while 23,000 employed, three or more workers.

The reforms of 1949 and, especially those of 1944-46, sapped the agricultural bourgeoisie to a large extent. During the postwar years, 22,300 farms were pared down. The maximum allowance of 30 hectares was given only to 29 percent of the pared-down farms, while others were left, considerably less—25, 20, 15 and even 5 hectares of land. In the summer of 1944, over 8,000 farmers with an excess of more than 20 hectares of land, departed for the West. The better-to-do Vilnius region farmers left for Poland. The ranks of the better-to-do farmers were also thinned out, considerably, by the 1941, as well as, postwar deportations. Finally, some larger farms split up, dividing the land among family members.

V. Lenin's words, describing Russia during its NEP (New Economic Policy) Period, totally befit Lithuania during the postwar period: "Farmers have become more average than in former times, land has been distributed for very equal use, the kulak has been undermined.... Everything has been equalized, the farmers have, in general, been placed in a middle-class position" (Works, Vol. 32, p. 191, V, 1955)

In spite of this, starting with the fall of 1947, the kulak problem began to be artificially blown out of proportion, in Lithuania. Among those who became labeled as kulaks, were: farmers who used hired labor, posessed complex agricultural machinery (threshers, tractors, engines, motors) mills, sawmills, had leased their livestock, seeds and tools to other farmers, or had bought up agricultural products with the intention of reselling them. Those farmers, who hired help for harvesting, or had employed people during the Hitlerite occupation were also considered kulaks.

Local officials often used to "kulakize" those with a larger number of hectares, especially those farmers, who did not join the kolkhozes.

The Ministry of Finance was perhaps, the heaquarters in the struggle agains the "kulaks"—even back in the autumn of 1947, without waiting for a government decision, it began to compile lists of kulaks. The list compilation continued until 1953, i.e., the year of Stalin's death, with 15,000, i.e. four percent of the farmers, included among them. [passage omitted]

In his, "Concerning Cooperation," Lenin wrote about everyone's cooperation, including that of kulaks (Works, Vol 33, p 426, 429-430, V. 1955). In Lithuania, however, just as in other republics, kulaks, in truth, those who were supposedly kulaks, were not accepted into kolkhozes.

Many of the families, included in kulak lists, were deported; a number of them moved to cities, or left for other republics (Kaliningrad area, Latvia). Only a few were able to "penetrate" into kolkhozes. In 1948 the Pasvaliai Communist Party (b) Secretary, Mikalauskas and Executive Committee Chairman, Grazinis, were given a party penalty, for their "political blindness," in allowing kulaks to join kolkhozes.

Collectivization in Lithuania took place much faster than in the other Soviet Republics. There, it took two five-year plans to herd the farmers into kolkhozes, while in Lithuania this was accomplished in the course of several years. By the end of 1950, almost 90 percent of all farmers were collectivized.

Methods of forced collectivization, disposession of farmers, introduction of a strictly centralized command system in kolkhozes, and essentially unpaid, forced labor by the kolkhoz workers, precipitated a major decline in agricultural production. [passage omitted]

Following World War I and the struggle for independence, it took Lithuania's agriculture 3 years to revive itself, however, following collectivization, it took until the mid-seventies, to reach the pre-war level. Although the republic's agriculture is among the most advanced in the union, general results, in its development, are modest. Restructuring, now underway in the country, is affording Lithuanian farmers the opportunity to seek new avenues in agricultural development for production increase and product quality improvement.

Kazakh Private Detective Agency Formed
LD2007082189 Moscow TASS in English
0713 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Alma-Ata July 20 TASS—By TASS correspondents Konstantin Yemelyanov and Yerkin Zikibayev

The main task of Kazakhstan's first private detective firm is to strengthen law and order and socialist legality. It was founded at the Alma-Ata cooperative Pomoshch (AID) today. The list of services includes protection of life, health and property of citizens and cooperatives, a search for missing people and rapid collection of unclassified information.

The new firm invites for work retired law enforcement officers. Their experience will be helpful for people.

First Tatar-Language Supplement Published
18001344 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
8 Jul 89 First Edition p 6

[S. Troyan report: "In the Language of the Crimean Tatars"]

[Text] Simferopol—The first issue of a weekly supplement—DOSTLUK—to KRMYSKAYA PRAVDA in the Crimean Tatar language has been published. It does not duplicate the oblast newspaper but is a separate publication.

The desire of those who have repeatedly expressed the idea of having a newspaper in their own language has become a reality, said Sh. Ramazanov, the editor of the new newspaper. Yet another step has been taken in solving the existing complexities in interethnic relations. Our small creative collective has no doubt that the weekly will become a reliable aid in the life and work of all who care about the fate of the language, literature, and entire culture of a numerically small people that in the years of Stalin was subjected to unjustified repressions. We have no experience in publishing these kinds of supplements in a national language. DOSTLUK is a unique trailblazer. One thing is clear: the newspaper will not be isolated but will elucidate all aspects of life in the Crimea.

In addition to the official greetings traditional in such cases, the first issue will contain an article by Akhtem Tippa, the director of the Agrarnyy sovkhoz [state farm] that was set up just over a year ago, a story about Aygerdzhi Seidyakub, a brigade leader in a lease subdivision of the agricultural trading enterprise imeni 50-letiye Velikoy Oktyabrskoy sotsialisticheskoy revolyutsii in Dzhankoyskiy Rayon, and other material devoted to the labor and everyday life of the Crimean Tatar part of the population on the peninsula.

The circulation of the weekly is still small at 3,000 copies. But the prospects for the new publication are good and there will be more subscribers: the process of returning the Crimean Tatars to the land of their forefathers is under way. The Crimean Tatar language is now being taught in 12 grades in oblast schools and optionally in 75 special groups.

Ecology Publication Appears in Kostroma
LD0807153189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1300 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Summary] A new publication, the EKOLOGICHESKAYA VESTNIK, has come out in Kostroma oblast. The state committee of Kostroma oblast for the protection of nature is publishing it. The first edition reports that only a third of the toxic substances released by industry in the oblast are stopped from entering the atmosphere. The doses of pollution which the Volga gets from water purification facilities in Kostroma exceed the maximum concentration levels allowed for oil-based products by several tens of times.

Economic

1989 Midyear Economic Results Released
LD2707174889 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 27 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] The results of the USSR's social and economic development for the first half of 1989 have been summed up. Nikitich Kirichenko, doctor of economics and chairman of the State Statistics Committee, comments.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] Vadim Nikitich, not so long ago this report which the Goskomstat [State Statistics Committee] prepared on the results of the first half of 1989 would have been described as sensational.

[Kirichenko] I think that this should not be called sensational because this is the line of development, the general movement in society toward openness and glasnost. It predetermines, so to speak, more openness in statistics. Here are a few examples. The course adopted is to develop varied forms of economic management. The report gives not only a purely quantitative description but we also indicate the social structure of the population's employment. There is also topical information about phenomena which used to be unusual for our society: mass absenteeism from work and strikes. In the first half of the year the losses of working time for these reasons was over 2 million man/days. That means that nationwide 15,000 people were not working each day. Or, another example, now the public is very interested in the differentiation of incomes among the population and the report groups the population according to average income per head.

There is increased information on the provision of goods to the population, on the state of the environment, on road accidents, and on the state of law and order.

[Correspondent] Why does the report not contain a single word about how the conversion process [of military enterprises to civilian use] is going?

[Kirichenko] A very important decision has been made in this sphere. As soon as we have significant results this will undoubtedly be published in our reports and be made widely available.

On the whole, the socioeconomic situation in the country remains complicated and we have been unable to consolidate the rates of economic growth achieved last year.

[Correspondent] Why do you think that we have not managed to consolidate these rates?

[Kirichenko] The new economic mechanism which is being introduced and being introduced consistently has not been fully put into operation.

[Correspondent] What failures have there been in this half year?

[Kirichenko] I would like to name some acute problems which, in my opinion should be given attention. The first thing is the situation on the consumer market. According to the figures, there has been some progress and the retail trade turnover increased by R16.5 billion. These are impressive figures and the rate is quite high at the level of 9.4 percent. But if you look deeper into the essence of the matter, it turns out that the consumer is not satisfied. Almost one-third of the growth in trade turnover is accounted for by alcoholic drinks, about a quarter is accounted for by an increase in average retail prices. There is still a shortage of many types of goods. And so, an increase in the output of goods for the population and particularly foodstuffs is a very important concern for all sectors of public production, the concern for each labor collective. The second thing is that, in my view, particular concern is caused by the unprecedented increase in the population's monetary income. It is running ahead of the production of consumer goods; It is higher than the increase in labor productivity. Undoubtedly, incomes should rise but they should rise in line with the rise in the final results.

Yet another alarm bell is ringing: putting into use housing built with centralized, state capital investment is four percent lower than in the past half year. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Aganbegyan To Head Soviet-Swiss Joint Venture

PM2707160889 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 30, 23 Jul 89 p 7

[Unattributed report on interview with economist Abel Aganbegyan: "Top Soviet Economist To Head Joint Venture"]

[Text] Soviet economist Abel Aganbegyan, head of the economic branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences, has been elected head of a small group of top economists, members of the Link (the 'K' is backwards), a new Soviet-Swiss consulting agency for businessmen.

The joint venture's founders are the USSR Zhilsotsbank, the USSR Academy of Sciences Commission on Production Forces and Natural Resources Study, and the Swiss consultative firm Ton Coper Creative Direction.

Abel Aganbegyan: "Our joint venture will help promote economic contacts between Soviet and Western business people in various ways. We see information as the key given the great demand for information in the west about the USSR. We will publish what we call a Contact-Dossier—something that sets our venture apart from others like it—an individualized information file for our customers.

"To do business in the USSR, the foreign businessman should be familiar with the country's general economic structure, the rouble's prospects for becoming convertible, the market prospects inside the country, Soviet laws pertaining to the foreign economy and customs, terms of credit, conditions of life for foreigners in the USSR, etc.

"Even more important, the foreign industrialist should have detailed information about developments in his area of interest. If you are in personal computers, you won't care much about the situation in petrochemical or footwear production. But you must know about the Soviet personal computer market, demand, which PCs [personal computers] are manufactured, existing factories and joint ventures, the government's policy in this

sphere, who in the USSR is responsible for electronics, etc. So we decided to publish this information in a dossier to be mailed to our customers. It consists of three parts. Part one will contain several editorials, part three will be for reference. Part two will contain a package of customer-tailored information, announcements and ads of Soviet enterprises.

"This publication will be in English and printed abroad, first every month and later possibly, every two weeks. The inaugural issue will appear this October. A monthly subscription costs 800 dollars.

"This is a normal price for this kind of a publication and covers the high quality and exclusive nature of the exclusive information. Our publication is not for everbody, but 'for you', the thousands of business people, our customers, who are seriously interested in doing business with the USSR.

"We are also planning a Contact-Dossier in Russian for Soviet enterprises early next year. Link will also offer economic and legal consulting, partner searches workshops, translation services, etc."

Adds Ton Coper: "In recent months I have met with many business people interested in cooperating with Soviet partners. I expect good results as regards the operation of our venture."

For details, please, contact Link at this address:

Link 40-42, Shcherbakovskaya, Moscow 105187.

Telephones: 369-26-43, 369-23-51.

Telex and telefax are coming soon.

Agricultural

Problems in Grain Transport Reported

PM2807111589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by V. Gavrichkin under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Teletype": "Before the Village's Eyes the 'Everests' of Grain Are Growing on the Elevator Platforms. What Is Preventing Us From Coping Thriftily With the Harvest We Have Raised?"]

[Text] The arable farmers of Rostov Oblast are selling their third million tonnes of grain to the state. And more than 1.8 million tonnes of wheat, of which 84 percent of the strong and valuable strains, has already reached the grain reception enterprises.

Nearly 2.3 million tonnes of grain have been unloaded at the elevators by the collective farms [kolkhozes] and state farms [sovkhozes] of Krasnodar Kray. The threshing rate in the Kuban is excellent: On average 41.7 quintals while the wheat harvest is even more—43.5 quintals.

Over 30 quintals per hectare is being produced by the Stavropol fields. Formerly 1978, when an average of 26.5 quintals was harvested, was considered the best year here.

The harvest in the North Caucasus is reaching its end. The arable farmers—it is already possible to say this—have done their job. How can they fail to rejoice at this success!

"This is the 10th harvest I have observed in Stavropol, but I have never before seen one like it," our correspondent V. Oliyanchuk reports. "Even in the kray's most arid eastern zone the Arzgirskiy Rayon farmers, for instance, are harvesting 50 quintals per hectare on many fields. A real miracle! I have visited a number of rayons and seen that there are almost no fields where the situation is 'so-so,' everywhere the harvest is excellent."

Have they been lucky? To some extent, yes: The grain grower always needs a little luck. But let's take into account the exceptionally high standard of cultivation of the fields here, the accomplished technology, including Stavropol Kray's very own zonal intensive technology using the minimum of chemicals, and the very precise organization. All this has already been manifested in full. And now....

The mighty flow of grain is literally overwhelming the elevators and reception points. The problem of the rapid shipment—primarily of the most valuable grain—to other regions of the country and to the center has arisen in all its magnitude. But every day half the number of cars ordered arrive. Work is at fever pitch at the Levokumskiy, Izobilnenskiy, and Maslov Kutskiy elevators—in the rayons which have brought in a bigger harvest than the others.

The picture is frankly depressing. Wresting such a pleasing and big grain harvest from the rains only to be unable to cope with it at the elevators.... But perhaps this is an "individual case" and things are quite different for the kray's neighbors?

Rostov—the harvest on the Don has long passed its peak and mountains of excellent grain have accumulated on the threshing floors while at the elevators there are not just mountains but "Everests" of grain, IZVESTIYA correspondent V. But reports. Capacities are crammed. Salskiy, Proletarskiy, and all the Eastern rayons are sounding the alarm: The grain is not being shipped out, the railroad workers are letting them down. Even in previous years the mass disorder in organizing purchases frequently led to a situation where the farms would fulfill and overfulfill deliveries yet thousands of tonnes of grain would meanwhile become soaked on the elevators' open platforms. It may be said that the results of all our efforts are perishing before the village's eyes. And not only of our present-day efforts. I remember the alarm with which A. Shcherbak, manager of a section of the Vilyams sovkhoz, spoke:

"Before 1 August we must prepare the soil to sow the winter crops—the application of nutrients is very great and we must feed the fields. But there is nothing to feed them with: No fertilizers have arrived for 2 months, all the schedules have been wrecked...."

Krasnodar—in order not to keep the grain at unadapted threshing floors, the elevator capacities must be unloaded and 0.5 million tonnes of grain dispatched from them by the end of the month, A. Ugryumov, chief of the kray grain products administration, told our correspondent A. Dergachev. We have been able to dispatch only half: There are no cars.

The way out? The Krasnodar people are being advised: Of your 48 elevators only 15-20 are overloaded. Ship the grain to those where there are capacities. But what are we to use to ship the grain if there are no grain cars? Of course, we could use automotive transport but...there is no fuel. In brief, an impasse.

The arable farmers of Yeyskiy Rayon, whence grain is shipped via the sea port on barges of the Volga-Don steamship company, are in a somewhat better position. But after all even the barges are in short supply. For instance, their neighbors—the grain growers of Shcherbinovskiy Rayon—are not being issued with any barges at all, although nearly 100,000 tonnes of grain have already accumulated here and there is nowhere left to pour it. There is also a shortage of covered threshing floors on the farms. And the rains come almost every day. They would like to resolve the barges question, but there is no one with whom to resolve it: I. Mostovoy, chief of the Volga-Don steamship company, has timed his vacation for the height of the harvest season.

The situation which has taken shape on the fields and threshing floors and at the grain reception points of the North Caucasus economic region obliges us to put several questions to the leaders of a number of ministries and departments.

Ministry of railroads. What has been done to ease the grain shipments situation in the North Caucasus? Have the blunders committed here been taken into account in planning grain shipments from other regions of the country?

For instance, it is not clear who is disrupting and why the schedule for deliveries of the fertilizers necessary to carry out the sowing of winter crops and the fall plowing of the fields.

But the grain growers are putting one of their main questions today to the USSR State Committee for Standards. And an explanation is needed here.

Reports of purchases of strong and valuable wheat grain are gratifying—they have done well and that means we will have a large amount of grain. But will we? First, one cannot understand how, at overfilled elevators, it is possible to form and store individually consignments of high-quality food grain. And second....

The grain crops are ending up in the rain and as a result the grain is losing its color and so-called vitreousness. Yet these requirements are stipulated by the State Committee for Standards for strong wheat. Failing to make amendments to the standard is after all not only depriving the grain growers of considerable supplements to the price for the quality of the grain but also enabling procurement workers to mix consignments of this grain with ordinary, mediocre grain and let valuable food wheat go for forage.

This is not a new question. Exactly a year ago we raised it in the commentary "The Better the Dearer." We received an angry letter in which A. Navolotskiy, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Standards, accused the newspaper of calling for a lowering of grain quality. Defending the State Standard, he wrote in particular: "Of the indicators enumerated it is difficult to exclude even one because each of them describes the quality of wheat grain and determines the consumer properties of the grain, bread, and pasta manufactured from it. These same indicators and demands are established in standards in all countries in the world and are included in the draft international standard of the International Organization for Standardization for soft wheat."

Who would argue were we sending our grain abroad. But for the time being, unfortunately, we are not exporters, we ourselves buy grain for currency—every third bread loaf in our country is made of "foreign" flour and of far from the best quality. So is it sensible to spend our money while at the same time feeding our own fine wheat to livestock? Ask any baker and he will tell you that wheat's loss of this "vitreousness" in no way affects the quality of the flour or the bread baked from it. We think that the state standard for domestic consumption, so to speak, like the price, should be more flexible.

...Our correspondents report that permission (so far only by telephone, it is true) has finally been received to change the state standard. But again, as a year ago, with a big delay.

Rainfall Causes Flooding in Maritime Kray

LD2707110589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] A report from Maritime Kray:

The monthly norm of precipitation has fallen during the past 2 days on eastern regions of Maritime Kray. The prolonged rainfall has turned small rivers into raging flows. The evacuation to safety of the population of rural areas of Partizanskiy Valley began today. Military subunits and helicopters are taking part. A headquarters has been set up to eliminate the consequences of flooding. In Lazovskiy and Partizanskiy rayons agricultural work has

been interrupted. The delivery of produce from these places to the towns has stopped, and there are no telephone links with these rayons. A TASS correspondent adds that the weathermen promise a sharp worsening in the weather for the next 2 days. A typhoon is moving on Maritime kray from the south. The towns and villages of the kray are getting ready to meet it.

Military

'Vremya' Newscast Reports on Tank Conversion

LD2707220289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Newsreader] From 24-26 July, Comrade Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was in the city of Kharkov.

[Slipchenko] These pictures were shown in the Vremya program several weeks ago and, to be frank, they made me shudder. [Video shows tanks without their guns, lines of intact tanks and various other military vehicles] This is military equipment which has been prepared for destruction. On the one hand, we are moving toward peace. This makes everyone glad. But on the other hand, how much human labor, science, thought and resources have been invested in these machines! And now they are being put to the knife or are being re-cast. This is how they are cut. [video shows workers with welding guns on top of tanks] And this is how they are re-cast. [video shows a civil engineering machine which has been made out of a tank] But, all the same, they were created for combat, and not for work. You will say that this is conversion underway. But everything is not so simple. [video: Slipchenko appears on the screen against a background of tracked vehicles on a plain]

It would seem that it is just one step from modern combat equipment to equipment of a deeply civil purpose. But that is merely an illusion. A whole range of special measures have to be conducted in order to create new equipment for civilian purpose on the basis of military equipment. And the people who are now speaking so much about conversion consider that, as soon as the military industrial complex and the branches in that complex restructure, celestial manna will pour down on us from the sky. No, unfortunately this will not happen. It is still necessary to do much work in order to re-cast equipment and technology in the workshops and at the works so as to create equipment with an entirely different purpose. I am sure that many who work in the Far North, in Siberia and across the country are watching enviously these military machines now. These machines can successfully compete, in terms of technical characteristics, with such famous firms as Caterpillar and Mitsubishi, but military equipment has one fundamental difference from civilian equipment. It is impossible to simply mechanically re-deploy these machines with construction workers to lay roads. As the saying goes, it will cost you more than it's worth. The point is that these installations have been made for engineering troops on the basis of contemporary tanks. [video shows military engineering vehicles on tracks] A tank is designed for powerful, thrusting actions. When the engine works in extreme regimes, its efficiency is low. And when it is developed, the endless re-assembly work and preventive checks, repairs and searches for spare parts, which are familiar to us, will begin, and the workers will spend their time doing repairs rather than working. This, after all, is just one problem of the conversion.

And what about the modern tank? There is one, but it is made for combat. [video shows moving tank] So what then is conversion? The trip of Oleg Dmitriyevich Baklanov to Kharkov was devoted partially to this problem. He saw the testing-range and many enterprises, including this one. This is where tanks are made. [video shows Baklanov and Belousov watching assembly workers in a workshop] What bothers people? During conversations and chats with the secretary of the Central Committee, the theme of conversion was placed on the same level of importance with problems of housing and diet. People asked him: What will become of us? Our tanks are not needed, but does the country need these four-wheeled motorbikes? The whole point is that tanks, motorcycles, road-laying machinery and much more is needed by us today. But how can one get the defence industry to produce everything at the one time? Many meetings with tank-builders, designers and scientific experts in modern military equipment were devoted to this.

[Begin Baklanov recording, addressing a gathering] We are proceeding from a principle of reasonable sufficiency in our defense, and we are conducting our policy in this sense. But I must say that we should not delude ourselves here. We must always remember that we are responsible for defense first and foremost. And nobody can, and it is impermissible for anybody, to leave the country defenseless. We must understand, in this sense, that we can buy bread and we can buy various machines, but nowhere can we purchase tanks. And not only are we able to make them, but we must make them the best in the world. However, this does not mean that we should agree to confrontation, that we once more should not count the money which we allocate to defence. All that has already subsided into the past. We must build our policy in a rational way, and we must build our economic policy in a rational way. [end recording]

[Slipchenko] As for our military equipment today, the quantity must be reasonable, and the quality must be sufficiently high. that is reasonable sufficiency.

Yazov, Lizichev Discuss Gorbachev Report

PM2707131589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Jul 89 First Edition p 1

[Unnamed own correspondent report: "Key Task of the Day"]

[Text] A conference of members of military councils and chiefs of the political directorates of branches of the Armed Forces, districts, groups of forces, and fleets has

been held at the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. The results of the CPSU Central Committee conference of first secretaries of union republic communist party central committees, oblast committees, and kray committees were discussed, as were the tasks of Army and Navy political organs and party organizations stemming from the theses set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's report "Restructuring Party Work Is the Most Important Key Task of the Day."

Those present were addressed by Army General D. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, and Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

Adm Makarov Says USSR Needs Strong Navy

LD2707165489 Moscow TASS in English 1113 GMT 27 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 27 TASS—"The main mission of the Soviet Navy is to avert aggression against the country, which fully accords with the purely defensive military doctrine of the USSR," Admiral Konstantin Makarov, chief of the Main Naval Headquarters, said in a TASS interview in connection with Navy Day, which is marked in the Soviet Union on July 30.

He explained that the Soviet Union "has to proceed from the need to neutralise the action of enemy's strike forces in ocean and sea areas from which they can threaten our territory."

It is precisely these circumstancs that, in the admiral's opinion, demand the presence of a relatively small number of large ocean-going surface ships and versatile nuclear-powered submarines among the Soviet fleet.

"The Soviet navy now has up-to-date nuclear- and diesel-powered submarines with missile and torpedo weaponry, versatile and all-weather naval aviation. We regard these forces as the main fleet," the admiral went on to say.

"Apart from the main fleet, there are also aircraft-carrying cruisers with planes and helicopters on board, heavy and light cruisers with guided missiles and artillery, destroyers, and large anti-submarine ships as well as escort and small ships and boats.

"Besides, the navy also comprises shore rocket-and-artillery troops and comparatively small but mobile and well-prepared marine units."

The admiral said that, despite a sufficiently large number of submarines, "only one of every six submarines is intended to accomplish predominantly strike missions."

There are slightly more than 100 surface ships capable of operating in the ocean at long distances from their bases, I.E., large surface combatant ships. At the same time coastal ships and boats which perform purely defensive functions account for more than half of the entire number of ships in the Soviet Union.

"The share of coastal ships is only six per cent of the U.S. Navy and the rest are large surface ships and submarines intended for operation in far-off areas of the ocean," the admiral added.

He believes that the Soviet Union "needs a strong Navy so far". This should be a navy which would guarantee the Soviet Union's security and correspond to the might of the country both quantitatively and qualitatively.

"This should be a fleet which acts to ensure strategic stability in the world," Admiral Makarov said.

Military Freight Train Blast Kills Two

PM2707151789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Explosion on Train"]

[Text] At 1710 hours 19 July there was an explosion on a train carrying explosive military freight on the stretch of line between Gruzdevka and Kargat on the West Siberian Railroad.

Our correspondent S. Ostanin telephoned Captain M. Vereshchagin, duty officer at the Siberian Military District Political Directorate, and asked him about it.

"En route a fire started in one of the cars. The cause of the fire is being investigated by a USSR Defense Ministry special commission. The fire was noticed and the train was stopped. The railroad services were informed, which made it possible to close the line in good time.

"The first people to fight the fire were the servicemen guarding the freight. Unfortunately, they were unable to put out the flames. There was an explosion. Senior Warrant Officer 2d Class M. Meshkov, chief of the guard, and Warrant Officer Tsapkov, who had been fighting the fire, were killed. Two servicemen were injured and were treated by doctors from nearby villages. One soldier had a leg amputated.

"The explosion damaged four cars, 50 meters of track, and 300 meters of electrified line [elektroputi]. A crater 6 meters deep was created.

"Repair and restoration trains have been sent to the area to clear up after the explosion. Major A. Shamardin, military commissar of Kargatskiy Rayon, acted skillfully in organizing help for the railroad workers. Servicemen headed by Major S. Rozhnov also actively participated in the clean-up operation and in repairing the track.

"Trains were running on the repaired main line a day later."